arXiv:0802.1703v3 [math.SG] 5 Sep 2009

LAGRANGIAN FLOER THEORY ON COMPACT TORIC MANIFOLDS I

KENJI FUKAYA, YONG-GEUN OH, HIROSHI OHTA, KAORU ONO

Abstract. The present authors introduced the notion of *weakly unobstructed* Lagrangian submanifolds and constructed their *potential function* $\mathfrak{PO}$ purely in terms of A-model data in [FOOO3]. In this paper, we carry out explicit calculations involving $\mathfrak{PO}$ on toric manifolds and study the relationship between this class of Lagrangian submanifolds with the earlier work of Givental [Gi1] which advocates that quantum cohomology ring is isomorphic to the Jacobian ring of a certain function, called the Landau-Ginzburg superpotential. Combining this study with the results from [FOOO3], we also apply the study to various examples to illustrate its implications to symplectic topology of Lagrangian fibers of toric manifolds. In particular we relate it to Hamiltonian displacement property of Lagrangian fibers and to Entov-Polterovich's symplectic quasi-states.

Contents

1. Introduction 2
2. Compact toric manifolds 11
2.1. Complex structure 11
2.2. Symplectic structure 13
3. Deformation theory of filtered A_∞-algebras 15
4. Potential function 21
5. Examples 27
6. Quantum cohomology and Jacobian ring 33
7. Localization of quantum cohomology ring at moment polytope 41
8. Further examples and remarks 47
9. Variational analysis of potential function 52
10. Elimination of higher order term in nondegenerate cases 61

Date: Sep. 3, 2009.

Key words and phrases. Floer cohomology, toric manifolds, weakly unobstructed Lagrangian submanifolds, potential function, Jacobian ring, balanced Lagrangian fibers, quantum cohomology.

KF is supported partially by JSPS Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research No.18104001 and Global COE Program G08, YO by US NSF grant # 0503954, HO by JSPS Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research No.19340017, and KO by JSPS Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research, Nos. 17654009 and 18340014.

11. Calculation of potential function 75
12. Non-unitary flat connection on $L(u)$ 84
13. Floer cohomology at a critical point of potential function 88
14. Appendix 1 : Algebraically closedness of Novikov fields 94
15. Appendix 2 : T^n-equivariant Kuranishi structure 95
16. Appendix 3 : Smooth correspondence via the zero set of multisection 101
References 106

1. Introduction

Floer theory of Lagrangian submanifolds plays an important role in symplectic geometry since Floer's invention [Fl] of the Floer cohomology and subsequent generalization to the class of *monotone* Lagrangian submanifolds [Oh1]. After the introduction of A_∞ structure in Floer theory [Fu1] and Kontsevich's homological mirror symmetry proposal [Ko], it has also played an essential role in a formulation of mirror symmetry in string theory.

In [FOOO1], we have analyzed the anomaly $\partial^2 \neq 0$ and developed an obstruction theory for the definition of Floer cohomology and introduced the class of *unobstructed* Lagrangian submanifolds for which one can deform Floer's original definition of the 'boundary' map by a suitable bounding cochain denoted by b. Expanding the discussion in section 7 [FOOO1] and motivated by the work of Cho-Oh [CO], we also introduced the notion of *weakly unobstructed* Lagrangian submanifolds in Chapter 3 [FOOO3] which turns out to be the right class of Lagrangian submanifolds to look at in relation to the mirror symmetry of Fano toric A-model and Landau-Ginzburg B-model proposed by physicists (see [Ho], [HV]). In the present paper, we study the relationship between this class of Lagrangian submanifolds with the earlier work of Givental [Gi1] which advocates that quantum cohomology ring is isomorphic to the Jacobian ring of a certain function, which is called the Landau-Ginzburg superpotential. Combining this study with the results from [FOOO3], we also apply this study to symplectic topology of Lagrangian fibers of toric manifolds.

While appearance of bounding cochains is natural in the point of view of deformation theory, explicit computation thereof has not been carried out. One of the main purposes of the present paper is to perform this calculation in the case of fibers of toric manifolds and draw its various applications. Especially we show that each fiber $L(u)$ at $u \in \mathfrak{t}^*$ is weakly unobstructed for *any* toric manifold $\pi : X \to \mathfrak{t}^*$ (see Proposition 4.3), and then show that the set of the pairs $(L(u), b)$ of a fiber $L(u)$ and a weak bounding cochain b with nontrivial Floer cohomology can be calculated from the quantum cohomology of the ambient toric manifold, at least in the Fano case. Namely the set of such pairs $(L(u), b)$ is identified with the set of ring homomorphisms from quantum cohomology to the relevant Novikov ring. We also show by a variational analysis that for any compact toric manifold there exists at least one pair of (u, b)'s for which the Floer cohomology of $(L(u), b)$ is nontrivial.

We call a Lagrangian fiber (that is, a T^n-orbit) *balanced*, roughly speaking, if its Floer cohomology is nontrivial. (See Definition 4.11 for its precise definition.) The main result of this paper is summarized as follows.

(1) When X is a compact Fano toric manifold, we give a method to locate all the balanced fibers.

(2) Even when X is not Fano, we can still apply the same method to obtain a finite set of Lagrangian fibers. We prove this set coincides with the set of balanced Lagrangian fibers under certain nondegeneracy condition. This condition can be easily checked, when a toric manifold is given.

Now more precise statement of the main results are in order.

Let X be an n dimensional smooth compact toric manifold. We fix a T^n-equivariant Kähler form on X and let $\pi : X \to \mathfrak{t}^* \cong (\mathbb{R}^n)^*$ be the moment map. The image $P = \pi(X) \subset (\mathbb{R}^n)^*$ is called the *moment polytope*. For $u \in \operatorname{Int} P$, we denote $L(u) = \pi^{-1}(u)$. The fiber $L(u)$ is a Lagrangian torus which is an orbit of the T^n action. (See section 2. We refer readers to, for example, [Au], [Ful] for the details on toric manifolds.) We study the Floer cohomology defined in [FOOO3]. According to [FOOO1, FOOO3], we need an extra data, the bounding cochain, to make the definition of Floer cohomology more flexible to allow more general class of Lagrangian submanifolds. In the current context of Lagrangian torus fibers in toric manifolds, we use *weak bounding cochains*. Denote by $\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{weak}}(L(u);\Lambda_0)$ the moduli space of (weak) bounding cochains for a weakly unobstructed Lagrangian submanifold $L(u)$. (See the end of section 4.)

In this situation we first show that each element in $H^1(L(u);\Lambda_0)$ gives rise to a weak bounding cochain, i.e., there is a natural embedding

$$H^1(L(u);\Lambda_0) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{weak}}(L(u);\Lambda_0). \tag{1.1}$$

(See Proposition 4.3.) Here we use the universal Novikov ring

$$\Lambda = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_i T^{\lambda_i} \,\Big|\, a_i \in \mathbb{Q}, \lambda_i \in \mathbb{R}, \lim_{i\to\infty} \lambda_i = \infty \right\} \tag{1.2}$$

where T is a formal parameter. (We do not use the grading parameter e used in [FOOO3] since it will not play much role in this paper.) Then Λ_0 is a subring of Λ defined by

$$\Lambda_0 = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_i T^{\lambda_i} \in \Lambda \,\Big|\, \lambda_i \geq 0 \right\}. \tag{1.3}$$

We also use another subring

$$\Lambda_+ = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_i T^{\lambda_i} \in \Lambda \,\Big|\, \lambda_i > 0 \right\}. \tag{1.4}$$

We note Λ is the field of fractions of Λ_0 and Λ_0 is a local ring with maximal ideal Λ_+. Here we take the universal Novikov ring over $\mathbb{Q}$ but we also use universal Novikov ring over $\mathbb{C}$ or other ring R which we denote $\Lambda^{\mathbb{C}}$, Λ^R, respectively. (In case R does not contain $\mathbb{Q}$, Floer cohomology over Λ^R is defined only in Fano case.)

Remark 1.1. If we strictly follow the way taken in [FOOO3], we only get the embedding $H^1(L(u);\Lambda_+) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{weak}}(L(u))$, not (1.1). Here

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{weak}}(L(u)) = \mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{weak}}(L(u);\Lambda_+)$$

is defined in [FOOO3]. (We note that $\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{weak}}(L(u);\Lambda_+) \neq \mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{weak}}(L(u);\Lambda_0)$ where the right hand side is defined at the end of section 4.)

However we can modify the definition of weak unobstructedness so that (1.1) follows, using the idea of Cho [Cho]. See section 12.

Hereafter we use the symbol b for an element of $\mathcal{M}_{\rm weak}(L(u);\Lambda_+)$ and $\mathfrak{x}$ for an element of $\mathcal{M}_{\rm weak}(L(u);\Lambda_0)$.

We next consider the quantum cohomology ring $QH(X;\Lambda)$ with the universal Novikov ring Λ as a coefficient ring. (See section 6.) It is a commutative ring for the toric case, since $QH(X;\Lambda)$ is generated by even degree cohomology classes.

Definition 1.2. (1) We define the set $\mathrm{Spec}(QH(X;\Lambda))(\Lambda^{\mathbb{C}})$ to be the set of Λ algebra homomorphisms $\varphi : QH(X;\Lambda) \to \Lambda^{\mathbb{C}}$. (In other words it is the set of all $\Lambda^{\mathbb{C}}$ valued points of the scheme $\mathrm{Spec}(QH(X;\Lambda))$.

(2) We next denote by $\mathfrak{M}(\mathfrak{Lag}(X))$ the set of all pairs $(\mathfrak{x}, u)$, $u \in \mathrm{Int}\, P$, $\mathfrak{x} \in H^1(L(u);\Lambda_0^{\mathbb{C}})/H^1(L(u);2\pi\sqrt{-1}\mathbb{Z})$ such that

$$HF((L(u),\mathfrak{x}),(L(u),\mathfrak{x});\Lambda^{\mathbb{C}}) \neq \{0\}.$$

Theorem 1.3. *If X is a Fano toric manifold then*

$$\mathrm{Spec}(QH(X;\Lambda))(\Lambda^{\mathbb{C}}) \cong \mathfrak{M}(\mathfrak{Lag}(X)).$$

If $QH(X;\Lambda)$ is semi-simple in addition, we have

$$\sum_d \mathrm{rank}_{\mathbb{Q}} H_d(X;\mathbb{Q}) = \#\left(\mathfrak{M}(\mathfrak{Lag}(X))\right). \tag{1.5}$$

We remark that a commutative ring that is a finite dimensional vector space over a field (e.g., Λ in our case) is semi-simple if and only if it does not contain any nilpotent element. We also remark that a compact toric manifold is Fano if and only if every nontrivial holomorphic sphere has positive Chern number.

We believe that (1.5) still holds in the non-Fano case but are unable to prove it at the time of writing this paper. We however can prove that there exists a fiber $L(u)$ whose Floer cohomology is nontrivial, by a method different from the proof of Theorem 1.3. Due to some technical reason, we can only prove the following slightly weaker statement.

Theorem 1.4. *Assume the Kähler form ω of X is rational. Then, there exists $u \in \mathrm{Int}\, P$ such that for any $\mathcal{N} \in \mathbb{R}_+$ there exists $\mathfrak{x} \in H^1(L(u);\Lambda_0^{\mathbb{R}})$ with*

$$HF((L(u),\mathfrak{x}),(L(u),\mathfrak{x});\Lambda_0^{\mathbb{R}}/(T^{\mathcal{N}})) \cong H(T^n;\mathbb{R}) \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \Lambda_0^{\mathbb{R}}/(T^{\mathcal{N}}).$$

We suspect that the rationality assumption in Theorem 1.4 can be removed. It is also likely that we can prove $\mathfrak{M}(\mathfrak{Lag}(X))$ is nonempty but its proof at the moment is a bit cumbersome to write down. We can however derive the following theorem from Theorem 1.4, without rationality assumption.

Theorem 1.5. *Let X be an n dimensional compact toric manifold. There exists $u_0 \in \mathrm{Int}P$ such that the following holds for any Hamiltonian diffeomorphism $\psi : X \to X$,*

$$\psi(L(u_0)) \cap L(u_0) \neq \emptyset. \tag{1.6}$$

If $\psi(L(u_0))$ is transversal to $L(u_0)$ in addition, then

$$\#(\psi(L(u_0)) \cap L(u_0)) \geq 2^n. \tag{1.7}$$

Theorem 1.5 will be proved in section 13.

We would like to point out that (1.6) can be derived from a more general intersection result, Theorem 2.1 [EP1], obtained by Entov-Polterovich with a different method using a very interesting notion of partial symplectic quasi-state constructed

out of the spectral invariants defined in [Sc], [Oh3]. (See also [Vi], [Oh2] for similar constructions in the context of exact Lagrangian submanifolds.)

Remark 1.6. Strictly speaking, Theorem 2.1 [EP1] is stated under the assumption that X is semi-positive and ω is rational because the theory of spectral invariant was developed in [Oh3] under these conditions. The rationality assumption has been removed in [Oh4], [Us] and the semi-positivity assumption of ω removed by Usher [Us]. Thus the spectral invariant satisfying all the properties listed in [EP1] section 5 is now established for an arbitrary compact symplectic manifold. By the argument of [EP1] section 7, this implies the existence of a partial symplectic quasi-state. Therefore the proof of Theorem 2.1 [EP1] goes through without these assumptions (semi-positivity and rationality) and hence it implies (1.6). (See the introduction of [Us].) But the result (1.7) is new.

Our proof of Theorem 1.5 gives an explicit way of locating u_0, as we show in section 9. (The method of [EP1] is indirect and does not provide a way of finding such u_0. See [EP2]. Below, we will make some remarks concerning Entov-Polterovich's approach in the perspective of homological mirror symmetry.) In various explicit examples we can find more than one element u_0 that have the properties stated in this theorem. Following terminology employed in [CO], we call any such torus fiber $L(u_0)$ as in Theorem 1.4 a *balanced* Lagrangian torus fiber. (See Definition 4.11 for its precise definition.)

A criterion for $L(u_0)$ to be balanced, for the case $\mathfrak{x} = 0$, is provided by Cho-Oh [CO] and Cho [Cho] under the Fano condition. Our proofs of Theorems 1.4, 1.5 are much based on this criterion, and on the idea of Cho [Cho] of twisting *non-unitary* complex line bundles in the construction of Floer boundary operator. This criterion in turn specializes to the one predicted by physicists [HV], [Ho], which relates the location of u_0 to the critical points of the Landau-Ginzburg superpotential.

A precise description of balanced Lagrangian fibers including the data of bounding cochains involves the notion of a *potential function* : In [FOOO3], the authors have introduced a function

$$\mathfrak{PO}^L : \mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{weak}}(L) \to \Lambda_0$$

for an arbitrary weakly unobstructed Lagrangian submanifold $L \subset (X, \omega)$. By varying the function $\mathfrak{PO}^L$ over $L \in \{\pi^{-1}(u) \mid u \in \operatorname{Int} P\}$, we obtain the potential function

$$\mathfrak{PO} : \bigcup_{L \in \{\pi^{-1}(u) | u \in \operatorname{Int} P\}} \mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{weak}}(L) \to \Lambda_0. \tag{1.8}$$

This function is constructed purely in terms of A-model data of the general symplectic manifold (X, ω) *without* using mirror symmetry.

For a toric (X, ω), the restriction of $\mathfrak{PO}$ to $H^1(L(u); \Lambda_+)$ (see (1.1)) can be made explicit when combined with the analysis of holomorphic discs attached to torus fibers of toric manifolds carried out in [CO], at least in the Fano case. (In the non-Fano case we can make it explicit modulo 'higher order terms'.) This function extends to $H^1(L(u); \Lambda_0)$.

Remark 1.7. In [EP3] some relationships between quantum cohomology, quasi-state, spectral invariant and displacement of Lagrangian submanifolds are discussed : Consider an idempotent $\mathbf{i}$ of quantum cohomology. The (asymptotic) spectral

invariants associated to $\mathbf{i}$ gives rise to a partial symplectic quasi-state via the procedure concocted in [EP3], which in turn detects non-displaceability of certain Lagrangian submanifolds. (The assumption of [EP1] is weaker than ours.)

In the current context of toric manifolds, we could also relate them to Floer cohomology and mirror symmetry in the following way : Quantum cohomology is decomposed into indecomposable factors. (See Proposition 7.7.) Let $\mathbf{i}$ be the idempotent corresponding to one of the indecomposable factors. Let $L = L(u(1, \mathbf{i}))$ be a Lagrangian torus fiber whose non-displaceability is detected by the partial symplectic quasi-state obtained from $\mathbf{i}$. We conjecture that Floer cohomology $HF(L(u(1, \mathbf{i}), \mathfrak{x}), (L(u(1, \mathbf{i}), \mathfrak{x})))$ is nontrivial for some $\mathfrak{x}$. (See Remark 5.8.) This bounding cochain $\mathfrak{x}$ in turn is shown to be a critical point of the potential function $\mathfrak{PO}$ defined in [FOOO3].

On the other hand, $\mathbf{i}$ also determines a homomorphism $\varphi_{\mathbf{i}} : QH(X; \Lambda) \to \Lambda$. It corresponds to some Lagrangian fiber $L(u(2, \mathbf{i}))$ by Theorem 1.3. Then this will imply via Theorem 4.10 that the fiber $L(u(2, \mathbf{i}))$ is non-displaceable.

We conjecture that $u(1, \mathbf{i}) = u(2, \mathbf{i})$. We remark that $u(2, \mathbf{i})$ is explicitly calculable. Hence in view of the way $u(1, \mathbf{i})$ is found in [EP1], $u(1, \mathbf{i}) = u(2, \mathbf{i})$ will give some information on the asymptotic behavior of the spectral invariant associated with $\mathbf{i}$.

We fix a basis of the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{t}$ of T^n which induces a basis of $\mathfrak{t}^*$ and hence a coordinate of the moment polytope $P \subset \mathfrak{t}^*$. This in turn induces a basis of $H^1(L(u); \Lambda_0)$ for each $u \in \operatorname{Int} P$ and so identification $H^1(L(u); \Lambda_0) \cong (\Lambda_0)^n$. We then regard the potential function as a function

$$\mathfrak{PO}(x_1, \cdots, x_n; u_1, \cdots, u_n) : (\Lambda_0)^n \times \operatorname{Int} P \to \Lambda_0$$

and prove in Theorem 4.10 that Floer cohomology $HF((L(u), \mathfrak{x}), (L(u), \mathfrak{x}); \Lambda)$ with $\mathfrak{x} = (\mathfrak{x}_1, \cdots, \mathfrak{x}_n)$, $u = (u_1, \cdots, u_n)$ is nontrivial if and only if $(\mathfrak{x}, u)$ satisfies

$$\frac{\partial \mathfrak{PO}}{\partial x_i}(\mathfrak{x}; u) = 0, \quad i = 1, \cdots, n. \tag{1.9}$$

To study (1.9), it is useful to change the variables x_i to

$$y_i = e^{x_i}.$$

In these variables we can write potential function as a sum

$$\mathfrak{PO}(x_1, \cdots, x_n; u_1, \cdots, u_n) = \sum T^{c_i(u)} P_i(y_1, \cdots, y_n)$$

where P_i are Laurent polynomials which do not depend on u, and $c_i(u)$ are positive real valued functions. When X is Fano, we can express the right hand side as a finite sum. (See Theorem 4.5.)

We define a function $\mathfrak{PO}^u$ of y_i's by

$$\mathfrak{PO}^u(y_1, \cdots, y_n) = \mathfrak{PO}(x_1, \cdots, x_n; u_1, \cdots, u_n)$$

as a Laurent polynomial of n variables with coefficient in Λ. We denote the set of Laurent polynomials by

$$\Lambda[y_1, \cdots, y_n, y_1^{-1}, \cdots, y_n^{-1}]$$

and consider its ideal generated by the partial derivatives of $\mathfrak{PO}^u$. Namely

$$\left(\frac{\partial \mathfrak{PO}^u}{\partial y_i}; i = 1, \cdots, n \right).$$

Definition 1.8. We call the quotient ring

$$Jac(\mathfrak{PO}^u) = \frac{\Lambda[y_1, \cdots, y_n, y_1^{-1}, \cdots, y_n^{-1}]}{\left(\frac{\partial \mathfrak{PO}^u}{\partial y_i}; i = 1, \cdots, n\right)}$$

the *Jacobian ring* of $\mathfrak{PO}^u$.

We will prove that the Jacobian ring is independent of the choice of u up to isomorphism (see the end of section 6) and so we will just write $Jac(\mathfrak{PO})$ for $Jac(\mathfrak{PO}^u)$ when there is no danger of confusion..

Theorem 1.9. *If X is Fano, there exists a Λ algebra isomorphism*

$$\psi_u : QH(X; \Lambda) \to Jac(\mathfrak{PO})$$

from quantum cohomology ring to the Jacobian ring such that

$$\psi_u(c_1(X)) = \mathfrak{PO}^u.$$

Theorem 1.9 (or Theorem 1.12 below) enables us to explicitly determine all the pairs $(\mathfrak{x}, u)$ with $HF((L(u), \mathfrak{x}), (L(u), \mathfrak{x}); \Lambda) \neq 0$ out of the quantum cohomology of X. More specifically Batyrev's presentation of quantum cohomology in terms of the Jacobian ring plays an essential role for this purpose. We will explain how this is done in sections 7, 8.

Remark 1.10.

(1) The idea that quantum cohomology ring coincides with the Jacobian ring begins with a celebrated paper by Givental. (See Theorem 5 (1) [Gi1].) There it was claimed also that the D module defined by an oscillatory integral with the superpotential as its kernel is isomorphic to S^1-equivariant Floer cohomology of periodic Hamiltonian system. When one takes its WKB limit, the former becomes the ring of functions on its characteristic variety, which is nothing but the Jacobian ring. The latter becomes the (small) quantum cohomology ring under the same limit. *Assuming* the Ansatz that quantum cohomology can be calculated by fixed point localization, these claims are proved in a subsequent paper [Gi2] for, at least, toric Fano manifolds. Then the required fixed point localization is made rigorous later in [GrPa]. See also Iritani [Iri1].

In physics literature, it has been advocated that Landau-Ginzburg model of superpotential (that is, the potential function $\mathfrak{PO}$ in our situation) calculates quantum cohomology of X. A precise mathematical statement thereof is our Theorem 1.9. (See for example p. 473 [MIRROR].)

Our main new idea entering in the proof of Theorem 1.3 other than those already in [FOOO3] is the way how we combine them to extract information on Lagrangian submanifolds. In fact Theorem 1.9 itself easily follows if we use the claim made by Batyrev that quantum cohomology of toric Fano manifold is a quotient of polynomial ring by the ideal of relations, called quantum Stanley-Reisner relation and linear relation. (This claim is now well established.) We include this simple derivation in section 6 for completeness' sake, since it is essential to take the Novikov ring Λ as the coefficient ring in our applications the version of which does not seem to be proven in the literature in the form that can be easily quoted.

(2) The proof of Theorem 1.9 given in this paper does not contain a serious study of pseudo-holomorphic spheres. The argument which we outline in

Remark 6.15 is based on open-closed Gromov-Witten theory, and different from other various methods that have been used to calculate Gromov-Witten invariant in the literature. In particular this argument does not use the method of fixed point localization. We will present this conceptual proof of Theorem 1.9 in a sequel to this paper.

(3) The isomorphism in Theorem 1.9 may be regarded as a particular case of the conjectural relation between quantum cohomology and Hochschild cohomology of Fukaya category. See Remark 6.15.

(4) In this paper, we only involve small quantum cohomology ring but we can also include big quantum cohomology ring. Then we expect Theorem 1.9 can be enhanced to establish a relationship between the Frobenius structure of the deformation theory of quantum cohomology (see, for example, [Man]) and that of Landau-Ginzburg model (which is due to K. Saito [Sa]). This statement (and Theorems 1.3, 1.9) can be regarded as a version of mirror symmetry between the toric A-model and the Landau-Ginzburg B-model. In various literature on mirror symmetry, such as [Ab], [AKO], [Ue], the B-model is dealt for Fano or toric manifolds in which the derived category of coherent sheaves is studied while the A-model is dealt for Landau-Ginzburg A-models where the directed A_∞ category of Seidel [Se2] is studied.

(5) In [Aur], Auroux discussed a mirror symmetry between the A-model side of toric manifolds and the B-model side of Landau-Ginzburg models. The discussion of [Aur] uses Floer cohomology with $\mathbb{C}$-coefficients. In this paper we use Floer cohomology over the Novikov ring which is more suitable for the applications to symplectic topology.

(6) Even when X is not necessarily Fano we can still prove a similar isomorphism
$$\psi_u : QH^\omega(X;\Lambda) \cong Jac(\mathfrak{PO}_0) \tag{1.10}$$
where the left hand side is the Batyrev quantum cohomology ring (see Definition 6.4) and the right hand side is the Jacobian ring of some function $\mathfrak{PO}_0$: it coincides with the actual potential function $\mathfrak{PO}$ 'up to higher order terms'. (See (4.9).) In the Fano case $\mathfrak{PO}_0 = \mathfrak{PO}$. (1.10) is Proposition 6.8.

(7) During the final stage of writing this article, a paper [CL] by Chan and Leung was posted in the Archive which studies the above isomorphism via SYZ transformations. They give a proof of this isomorphism for the case where X is a product of projective spaces and with the coefficient ring $\mathbb{C}$, not with Novikov ring. Leung presented their result [CL] in a conference held in Kyoto University in January 2008 where the first named author also presented the content of this paper.

From our definition, it follows that the leading order potential function $\mathfrak{PO}_0$ (see (4.9)) can be extended to the whole product $(\Lambda_0^{\mathbb{C}})^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$ in a way that they are invariant under the translations by elements in $(2\pi\sqrt{-1}\mathbb{Z})^n \subseteq (\Lambda_0^{\mathbb{C}})^n$. Hence we may regard $\mathfrak{PO}_0$ as a function defined on
$$\left(\Lambda_0^{\mathbb{C}}/(2\pi\sqrt{-1}\mathbb{Z})\right)^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \cong \left(\Lambda_0^{\mathbb{C}}/(2\pi\sqrt{-1}\mathbb{Z})\right)^n \times \mathbb{R}^n.$$
In the non-Fano case, the function $\mathfrak{PO}$ is invariant under the translations by elements in $(2\pi\sqrt{-1}\mathbb{Z})^n \subseteq (\Lambda_0^{\mathbb{C}})^n$ but may not extend to $\Lambda_0^{\mathbb{C}}/(2\pi\sqrt{-1}\mathbb{Z}))^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$. This is because the infinite sum appearing in the right hand side of (4.7) may not converge in non-Archimedean topology for $u \notin \operatorname{Int} P$.

Definition 1.11. We denote by

$$\mathrm{Crit}(\mathfrak{PO}_0), \quad (\text{respectively } \mathrm{Crit}(\mathfrak{PO}))$$

the subset of pairs

$$(\mathfrak{x}, u) \in (\Lambda_0^{\mathbb{C}}/(2\pi\sqrt{-1}\mathbb{Z}))^n \times \mathbb{R}^n, \quad (\text{respectively } (\mathfrak{x}, u) \in (\Lambda_0^{\mathbb{C}}/(2\pi\sqrt{-1}\mathbb{Z}))^n \times \mathrm{Int}\, P)$$

satisfying the equation

$$\frac{\partial \mathfrak{PO}_0}{\partial x_i}(\mathfrak{x}; u) = 0, \quad \left(\text{respectively } \frac{\partial \mathfrak{PO}}{\partial x_i}(\mathfrak{x}; u) = 0\right)$$

$i = 1, \cdots, n$.

We define $\mathfrak{M}(\mathfrak{Lag}(X))$ in Definition 1.2. (We use the same definition in non-Fano case.) In view of Theorem 1.12 (2) below, we also introduce the subset

$$\mathfrak{M}_0(\mathfrak{Lag}(X)) = \{(\mathfrak{x}, u) \in \mathrm{Crit}(\mathfrak{PO}_0) \mid u \in \mathrm{Int}\, P\}.$$

We also remark $\mathfrak{PO}_0 = \mathfrak{PO}$ in case X is Fano. The following is a more precise form of Theorem 1.3.

Theorem 1.12. (1) *There exists a bijection :*

$$\mathrm{Spec}(QH^\omega(X; \Lambda))(\Lambda^{\mathbb{C}}) \cong \mathrm{Crit}(\mathfrak{PO}_0).$$

(2) *There exists a bijection :*

$$\mathfrak{M}(\mathfrak{Lag}(X)) \cong \mathrm{Crit}(\mathfrak{PO}).$$

(3) *If X is Fano and $\mathfrak{x}$ is a critical point of $\mathfrak{PO}_0^u$ then $u \in \mathrm{Int}\, P$.*

(4) *If $QH^\omega(X; \Lambda)$ is semi-simple, then*

$$\sum_d \mathrm{rank}_\Lambda QH^\omega(X; \Lambda) = \#\left(\mathrm{Crit}(\mathfrak{PO}_0)\right).$$

Remark 1.13. (1) Theorem 1.12 (3) does not hold in non-Fano case. We give a counter example (Example 8.2) in section 8. In fact, in the case of Example 8.2 some of the critical points of $\mathfrak{PO}_0$ correspond to a point $u \in \mathbb{R}^n$ which lies outside the moment polytope.

(2) In the Fano case Theorem 1.12 (3) implies

$$\mathfrak{M}(\mathfrak{Lag}(X)) = \mathrm{Crit}(\mathfrak{PO}) = \mathrm{Crit}(\mathfrak{PO}_0).$$

We would like to point out that $\mathfrak{PO}_0$ is explicitly computable. But we do not know the explicit form of $\mathfrak{PO}$. However we can show that elements of $\mathrm{Crit}(\mathfrak{PO}_0)$ and of $\mathrm{Crit}(\mathfrak{PO})$ can be naturally related to each other under a mild nondegeneracy condition. (Theorem 10.4.) So we can use $\mathfrak{PO}_0$ in place of $\mathfrak{PO}$ in most of the cases. For example we can use it to prove that the following :

Theorem 1.14. *For any k, there exists a Kähler form on $X(k)$, the k points blow up of $\mathbb{C}P^2$, that is toric and has exactly $k+1$ balanced fibers.*

See Definition 4.11 for the definition of balanced fibers. Balanced fiber satisfies the conclusions (1.6), (1.7) of Theorem 1.5. We prove Theorem 1.14 in section 10.

Remark 1.15. The cardinality of $\mathfrak{x} \in H^1(L(u); \Lambda_0^{\mathbb{C}})/H^1(L(u); 2\pi\sqrt{-1}\mathbb{Z})$ with non-vanishing Floer cohomology is an invariant of Lagrangian submanifold $L(u)$. This is a consequence of [FOOO3] Theorem G (= [FOOO2] Theorem G).

The organization of this paper is now in order. In section 2 we gather some basic facts on toric manifolds and fix our notations. Section 3 is a brief review of Lagrangian Floer theory of [FOOO1, FOOO3]. In section 4, we describe our main results on the potential function $\mathfrak{PO}$ and on its relation to the Floer cohomology. We illustrate these theorems by several examples and derive their consequences in sections 5 - 10. We postpone their proofs until sections 11 - 13.

In section 5, we illustrate explicit calculations involving the potential functions in such examples as $\mathbb{C}P^n$, $S^2 \times S^2$ and the two points blow up of $\mathbb{C}P^2$. We also discuss a relationship between displacement energy of Lagrangian submanifold (see Definition 5.9) and Floer cohomology. In sections 6 and 7, we prove the results that mainly apply to the Fano case. Especially we prove Theorems 1.3, 1.9 and 1.12 in these sections. Section 7 contains some applications of Theorem 1.9 especially to the case of monotone torus fibers and to the $\mathbb{Q}$-structure of quantum cohomology ring. In section 8 we first illustrate usage of (the proof of) Theorem 1.3 to locate balanced fibers by the example of one point blow up of $\mathbb{C}P^2$. We then turn to the study of non-Fano cases and discuss Hirzebruch surfaces. Section 8 also contains some discussion on the semi-simplicity of quantum cohomology.

In sections 9 and 10, we prove the results that can be used in all toric cases, whether they are Fano or not. In section 9, using variational analysis, we prove existence of a critical point of the potential function, which is an important step towards the proof of Theorems 1.4 and 1.5. Using the arguments of this section, we can locate a balanced fiber in any compact toric manifold, explicitly solving simple linear equalities and inequalities finitely many times. In section 10, we prove that we can find the solution of (1.9) by studying its reduction to $\mathbb{C} = \Lambda_0^{\mathbb{C}}/\Lambda_+^{\mathbb{C}}$, which we call the leading term equation. This result is purely algebraic. It implies that our method of locating balanced fibers, which is used in the proof of Theorem 1.3, can be also used in the non-Fano case under certain nondegeneracy condition. We apply this method to prove Theorem 1.14. We discuss an example of blow up of $\mathbb{C}P^n$ along the high dimensional blow up center $\mathbb{C}P^m$ in that section. We also give several other examples and demonstrate various interesting phenomena which occur in Lagrangian Floer theory. For example we provide a sequence $((X, \omega_i), L_i)$ of pairs that have nonzero Floer cohomology for some choice of bounding cochains, while its limit $((X, \omega), L)$ has vanishing Floer cohomology for any choice of bounding cochain (Example 10.17). We also provide an example of Lagrangian submanifold L such that it has a nonzero Floer cohomology over $\Lambda^{\mathbb{C}}$ for some choice of bounding cochain, but vanishing Floer cohomology for any choice of bounding cochain over the field Λ^F with a field F of characteristic 3 (Example 10.19).

In section 11, we review the results on the moduli space of holomorphic discs from [CO] which are used in the calculation of the potential function. We rewrite them in the form that can be used for the purpose of this paper. We also discuss the non-Fano case in this section. (Our result is less explicit in the non-Fano case, but still can be used to explicitly locate balanced fibers in most of the cases.) In section 12, we use the idea of Cho [Cho] to deform Floer cohomology by an element from $H^1(L(u); \Lambda_0)$ rather than from $H^1(L(u); \Lambda_+)$. This enhancement is crucial to obtain an optimal result about the non-displacement of Lagrangian fibers. In section 13 we use those results to calculate Floer cohomology and complete the proof of Theorems 1.4 and 1.5 etc.

We attempted to make this paper largely independent of our book [FOOO1, FOOO3] as much as possible and also to make the relationship of the contents of the paper with the general story transparent. Here are a few examples :

(1) Our definition of potential function for the fibers of toric manifolds in this paper is given in a way independent of that of [FOOO3] except the statement on the existence of compatible Kuranishi structures and multi-sections on the moduli space of pseudo-holomorphic discs which provides a rigorous definition of Floer cohomology of single Lagrangian fiber. Such details are provided in section 3.1 [FOOO3] (= section 29 [FOOO2]).
(2) Similarly the definition of A_∞ algebra in this paper on the Lagrangian fiber of toric manifolds is also independent of the book except the process going from $A_{n,K}$ structure to A_∞ structure, which we refer to section 7.2 [FOOO3] (= section 30 [FOOO2]). However, for all the applications in this paper, only existence of $A_{n,K}$ structures is needed.
(3) The property of the Floer cohomology $HF(L, L)$ detecting Lagrangian intersection of L with its Hamiltonian deformation relies on the fact that Floer cohomology of the pair is independent under the Hamiltonian isotopy. This independence is established in [FOOO3]. In the toric case, its alternative proof based on the de Rham version is given in [FOOO4] in a more general form than we need in this paper.

The authors would like to thank H. Iritani and D. McDuff for helpful discussions. They would also like to thank the referee for various helpful comments.

2. Compact toric manifolds

In this section, we summarize basic facts on the toric manifolds and set-up our notations to be consistent with those in [CO], which in turn closely follow those in Batyrev [B1] and M. Audin [Au].

2.1. **Complex structure.** In order to obtain an n-dimensional compact toric manifold X, we need a combinatorial object Σ, a *complete fan of regular cones*, in an n-dimensional vector space over $\mathbb{R}$.

Let N be the lattice $\mathbb{Z}^n$, and let $M = Hom_{\mathbb{Z}}(N, \mathbb{Z})$ be the dual lattice of rank n. Let $N_{\mathbb{R}} = N \otimes \mathbb{R}$ and $M_{\mathbb{R}} = M \otimes \mathbb{R}$.

Definition 2.1. A convex subset $\sigma \subset N_{\mathbb{R}}$ is called a regular k-dimensional cone ($k \geq 1$) if there exists k linearly independent elements $v_1, \cdots, v_k \in N$ such that

$$\sigma = \{a_1 v_1 + \cdots + a_k v_k \mid a_i \in \mathbb{R}, a_i \geq 0\},$$

and the set $\{v_1, \cdots, v_k\}$ is a subset of some $\mathbb{Z}$-basis of N. In this case, we call $v_1, \cdots, v_k \in N$ the integral generators of σ.

Definition 2.2. A regular cone σ' is called a *face* of a regular cone σ (we write $\sigma' \prec \sigma$) if the set of integral generators of σ' is a subset of the set of integral generators of σ.

Definition 2.3. A finite system $\Sigma = \sigma_1, \cdots, \sigma_s$ of regular cones in $N_{\mathbb{R}}$ is called a *complete n-dimensional fan* of regular cones, if the following conditions are satisfied.

(1) if $\sigma \in \Sigma$ and $\sigma' \prec \sigma$, then $\sigma' \in \Sigma$;
(2) if σ, σ' are in Σ, then $\sigma' \cap \sigma \prec \sigma$ and $\sigma' \cap \sigma \prec \sigma'$;
(3) $N_{\mathbb{R}} = \sigma_1 \cup \cdots \cup \sigma_s$.

The set of all k-dimensional cones in Σ will be denoted by $\Sigma^{(k)}$.

Definition 2.4. Let Σ be a complete n-dimensional fan of regular cones. Denote by $G(\Sigma) = \{v_1, \cdots, v_m\}$ the set of all generators of 1-dimensional cones in Σ ($m = \text{Card } \Sigma^{(1)}$). We call a subset $\mathcal{P} = \{v_{i_1}, \cdots, v_{i_p}\} \subset G(\Sigma)$ a *primitive collection* if $\{v_{i_1}, \cdots, v_{i_p}\}$ does not generate p-dimensional cone in Σ, while for all $k\,(0 \leq k < p)$ each k-element subset of $\mathcal{P}$ generates a k-dimensional cone in Σ.

Definition 2.5. Let $\mathbb{C}^m$ be an m-dimensional affine space over $\mathbb{C}$ with the set of coordinates $z_1, \cdots, z_m$ which are in the one-to-one correspondence $z_i \leftrightarrow v_i$ with elements of $G(\Sigma)$. Let $\mathcal{P} = \{v_{i_1}, \cdots, v_{i_p}\}$ be a primitive collection in $G(\Sigma)$. Denote by $\mathbb{A}(\mathcal{P})$ the $(m-p)$-dimensional affine subspace in $\mathbb{C}^n$ defined by the equations

$$z_{i_1} = \cdots = z_{i_p} = 0.$$

Since every primitive collection $\mathcal{P}$ has at least two elements, the codimension of $\mathbb{A}(\mathcal{P})$ is at least 2.

Definition 2.6. Define the closed algebraic subset $Z(\Sigma)$ in $\mathbb{C}^m$ as follows

$$Z(\Sigma) = \bigcup_{\mathcal{P}} \mathbb{A}(\mathcal{P}),$$

where $\mathcal{P}$ runs over all primitive collections in $G(\Sigma)$. Put

$$U(\Sigma) = \mathbb{C}^m \setminus Z(\Sigma).$$

Definition 2.7. Let $\mathbb{K}$ be the subgroup in $\mathbb{Z}^m$ consisting of all lattice vectors $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_m)$ such that

$$\lambda_1 v_1 + \cdots + \lambda_m v_m = 0.$$

Obviously $\mathbb{K}$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}^{m-n}$ and we have the exact sequence:

$$0 \to \mathbb{K} \to \mathbb{Z}^m \xrightarrow{\pi} \mathbb{Z}^n \to 0, \tag{2.1}$$

where the map π sends the basis vectors e_i to v_i for $i = 1, \cdots, m$.

Definition 2.8. Let Σ be a complete n-dimensional fan of regular cones. Define $D(\Sigma)$ to be the connected commutative subgroup in $(\mathbb{C}^*)^m$ generated by all one-parameter subgroups

$$a_\lambda : \mathbb{C}^* \to (\mathbb{C}^*)^m,$$
$$t \mapsto (t^{\lambda_1}, \cdots, t^{\lambda_m})$$

where $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_m) \in \mathbb{K}$.

It is easy to see from the definition that $D(\Sigma)$ acts freely on $U(\Sigma)$. Now we are ready to give a definition of the compact toric manifold X_Σ associated with a complete n-dimensional fan of regular cones Σ.

Definition 2.9. Let Σ be a complete n-dimensional fan of regular cones. Then the quotient

$$X_\Sigma = U(\Sigma)/D(\Sigma)$$

is called the *compact toric manifold associated with* Σ.

There exists a simple open coverings of $U(\Sigma)$ by affine algebraic varieties.

Proposition 2.10. *Let σ be a k-dimensional cone in Σ generated by $\{v_{i_1}, \cdots, v_{i_k}\}$. Define the open subset $U(\sigma) \subset \mathbb{C}^m$ as*

$$U(\sigma) = \{(z_1, \cdots, z_m) \in \mathbb{C}^m \mid z_j \neq 0 \text{ for all } j \notin \{i_1, \cdots, i_k\}\}.$$

Then the open sets $U(\sigma)$ have the following properties:

(1)
$$U(\Sigma) = \bigcup_{\sigma \in \Sigma} U(\sigma);$$

(2) *if $\sigma \prec \sigma'$, then $U(\sigma) \subset U(\sigma')$;*

(3) *for any two cone $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \Sigma$, one has $U(\sigma_1) \cap U(\sigma_2) = U(\sigma_1 \cap \sigma_2)$; in particular,*
$$U(\Sigma) = \sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma^{(n)}} U(\sigma).$$

Proposition 2.11. *Let σ be an n-dimensional cone in $\Sigma^{(n)}$ generated by $\{v_{i_1}, \cdots, v_{i_n}\}$, which spans the lattice M. We denote the dual $\mathbb{Z}$-basis of the lattice N by $\{u_{i_1}, \cdots, u_{i_n}\}$. i.e.*

$$\langle v_{i_k}, u_{i_l} \rangle = \delta_{k,l} \tag{2.2}$$

where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is the canonical pairing between lattices N and M.

Then the affine open subset $U(\sigma)$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{C}^n \times (\mathbb{C}^*)^{m-n}$, the action of $D(\Sigma)$ on $U(\sigma)$ is free, and the space of $D(\Sigma)$-orbits is isomorphic to the affine space $U_\sigma = \mathbb{C}^n$ whose coordinate functions $y_1^\sigma, \cdots, y_n^\sigma$ are n Laurent monomials in $z_1, \cdots, z_m$:

$$\begin{cases} y_1^\sigma = z_1^{\langle v_1, u_{i_1} \rangle} \cdots z_m^{\langle v_m, u_{i_1} \rangle} \\ \quad \vdots \\ y_n^\sigma = z_1^{\langle v_1, u_{i_n} \rangle} \cdots z_m^{\langle v_m, u_{i_n} \rangle} \end{cases} \tag{2.3}$$

The last statement yields a general formula for the local affine coordinates $y_1^\sigma, \cdots, y_n^\sigma$ of a point $p \in U_\sigma$ as functions of its "homogeneous coordinates" $z_1, \cdots, z_m$.

2.2. **Symplectic structure.** In the last subsection, we associated a compact manifold X_Σ to a fan Σ. In this subsection, we review the construction of symplectic (Kähler) manifold associated to a convex polytope P.

Let M be a dual lattice, we consider a convex polytope P in $M_\mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$\{u \in M_\mathbb{R} \mid \langle u, v_j \rangle \geq \lambda_j \text{ for } j = 1, \cdots, m\} \tag{2.4}$$

where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is a dot product of $M_\mathbb{R} \cong \mathbb{R}^n$. Namely, v_j's are inward normal vectors to the codimension 1 faces of the polytope P. We associate to it a fan in the lattice N as follows: With any face Γ of P, fix a point u_0 in the (relative) interior of Γ and define

$$\sigma_\Gamma = \bigcup_{r \geq 0} r \cdot (P - u_0).$$

The associated fan is the family $\Sigma(P)$ of dual convex cones

$$\begin{aligned} \check{\sigma}_\Gamma &= \{x \in N_\mathbb{R} \mid \langle y, x \rangle \geq 0 \ \ \forall y \in \sigma_\Gamma\} && (2.5) \\ &= \{x \in N_\mathbb{R} \mid \langle u, x \rangle \leq \langle p, x \rangle \ \ \forall p \in P, u \in \Gamma\} && (2.6) \end{aligned}$$

where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is dual pairing $M_\mathbb{R}$ and $N_\mathbb{R}$. Hence we obtain a compact toric manifold $X_{\Sigma(P)}$ associated to a fan $\Sigma(P)$.

Now we define a symplectic (Kähler) form on $X_{\Sigma(P)}$ as follows. Recall the exact sequence :

$$0 \to \mathbb{K} \xrightarrow{i} \mathbb{Z}^m \xrightarrow{\pi} \mathbb{Z}^n \to 0.$$

It induces another exact sequence :

$$0 \to K \to \mathbb{R}^m/\mathbb{Z}^m \to \mathbb{R}^n/\mathbb{Z}^n \to 0.$$

Denote by k the Lie algebra of the real torus K. Then we have the exact sequence of Lie algebras:

$$0 \to k \to \mathbb{R}^m \xrightarrow{\pi} \mathbb{R}^n \to 0.$$

And we have the dual of above exact sequence:

$$0 \to (\mathbb{R}^n)^* \to (\mathbb{R}^m)^* \xrightarrow{i^*} k^* \to 0.$$

Now, consider $\mathbb{C}^m$ with symplectic form $\frac{i}{2}\sum dz_k \wedge d\overline{z}_k$. The standard action T^n on $\mathbb{C}^n$ is hamiltonian with moment map

$$\mu(z_1, \cdots, z_m) = \frac{1}{2}(|z_1|^2, \cdots, |z_m|^2). \tag{2.7}$$

For the moment map μ_K of the K action is then given by

$$\mu_K = i^* \circ \mu : \mathbb{C}^m \to k^*.$$

If we choose a $\mathbb{Z}$-basis of $\mathbb{K} \subset \mathbb{Z}^m$ as

$$Q_1 = (Q_{11}, \cdots, Q_{m1}), \cdots, Q_k = (Q_{1k}, \cdots, Q_{mk})$$

and $\{q^1, \cdots, q^k\}$ be its dual basis of $\mathbb{K}^*$. Then the map i^* is given by the matrix Q^t and so we have

$$\mu_K(z_1, \cdots, z_m) = \frac{1}{2}\left(\sum_{j=1}^m Q_{j1}|z_j|^2, \cdots, \sum_{j=1}^m Q_{jk}|z_j|^2\right) \in \mathbb{R}^k \cong k^* \tag{2.8}$$

in the coordinates associated to the basis $\{q^1, \cdots, q^k\}$. We denote again by μ_K the restriction of μ_K on $U(\Sigma) \subset \mathbb{C}^m$.

Proposition 2.12 (See Audin [Au])**.** *Then for any $r = (r_1, \cdots, r_{m-n}) \in \mu_K(U(\Sigma)) \subset k^*$, we have a diffeomorphism*

$$\mu_K^{-1}(r)/K \cong U(\Sigma)/D(\Sigma) = X_\Sigma \tag{2.9}$$

And for each (regular) value of $r \in k^*$, we can associate a symplectic form ω_P on the manifold X_Σ by symplectic reduction [MW].

To obtain the original polytope P that we started with, we need to choose r as follows: Consider λ_j for $j = 1, \cdots, m$ which we used to define our polytope P by the set of inequalities $\langle u, v_j\rangle \geq \lambda_j$. Then, for each $a = 1, \cdots, m-n$, let

$$r_a = -\sum_{j=1}^m Q_{ja}\lambda_j.$$

Then we have

$$\mu_K^{-1}(r_1, \cdots, r_{m-n})/K \cong X_{\Sigma(P)}$$

and for the residual $T^n \cong T^m/K$ action on $X_{\Sigma(P)}$, and for its moment map π, we have

$$\pi(X_{\Sigma(P)}) = P.$$

Using Delzant's theorem [De], one can reconstruct the symplectic form out of the polytope P (up to T^n-equivariant symplectic diffeomorphisms). In fact, Guillemin [Gu] proved the following explicit closed formula for the T^n-invariant Kähler form associated to the canonical complex structure on $X = X_\Sigma(P)$

Theorem 2.13 (Guillemin)**.** *Let P, $X_{\Sigma(P)}$, ω_P be as above and*

$$\pi : X_{\Sigma(P)} \to (\mathbb{R}^m/k)^* \cong (\mathbb{R}^n)^*$$

be the associated moment map. Define the functions on $(\mathbb{R}^n)^*$

$$\begin{aligned} \ell_i(u) &= \langle u, v_i\rangle - \lambda_i \ \text{ for } \ i = 1, \cdots, m \\ \ell_\infty(u) &= \sum_{i=1}^m \langle u, v_i\rangle = \left\langle u, \sum_{i=1}^m v_i \right\rangle. \end{aligned} \tag{2.10}$$

Then we have

$$\omega_P = \sqrt{-1}\partial\overline{\partial}\left(\pi^*\Big(\sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i(\log \ell_i) + \ell_\infty\Big)\right) \tag{2.11}$$

on $\operatorname{Int} P$.

The affine functions ℓ_i will play an important role in our description of potential function as in [CO] since they also measure symplectic areas $\omega(\beta_i)$ of the canonical generators β_i of $H_2(X, L(u); \mathbb{Z})$. More precisely we have

$$\omega(\beta_i) = 2\pi\ell_i(u) \tag{2.12}$$

(see Theorem 8.1 [CO]). We also recall

$$P = \{u \in M_{\mathbb{R}} \mid \ell_i(u) \geq 0,\ i = 1, \cdots, m\} \tag{2.13}$$

by definition (2.4).

3. Deformation theory of filtered A_∞-algebras

In this section, we provide a quick summary of the deformation and obstruction theory of Lagrangian Floer cohomology developed in [FOOO1, FOOO3] for readers' convenience. We also refer readers to the third named author's survey paper [Ohta] for a more detailed review, and refer to [FOOO3] for complete details of the proofs of the results described in this section.

We start our discussion with the classical unfiltered A_∞ algebra. Let C be a graded R-module where R is the coefficient ring. We denote by $C[1]$ its suspension defined by $C[1]^k = C^{k+1}$. Define the *bar complex* $B(C[1])$ by

$$B_k(C[1]) = \underbrace{C[1] \otimes \cdots \otimes C[1]}_{k}, \quad B(C[1]) = \bigoplus_{k=0}^{\infty} B_k(C[1]).$$

Here $B_0(C[1]) = R$ by definition. $B(C[1])$ has the structure of *graded coalgebra*.

Definition 3.1. The structure of A_∞ *algebra* is a sequence of R module homomorphisms

$$\mathfrak{m}_k : B_k(C[1]) \to C[1], \quad k = 1, 2, \cdots,$$

of degree $+1$ such that the coderivation $\widehat{d} = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \widehat{\mathfrak{m}}_k$ satisfies $\widehat{d}\widehat{d} = 0$, which is called the A_∞-*relation*. Here we denote by $\widehat{\mathfrak{m}}_k : B(C[1]) \to B(C[1])$ the unique extension of $\mathfrak{m}_k$ as a coderivation on $B(C[1])$, that is

$$\widehat{\mathfrak{m}}_k(x_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes x_n) = \sum_{i=1}^{k-i+1} (-1)^* x_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathfrak{m}_k(x_i, \cdots, x_{i+k-1}) \otimes \cdots \otimes x_n \quad (3.1)$$

where $* = \deg x_1 + \cdots + \deg x_{i-1} + i - 1$.

The relation $\widehat{d}\widehat{d} = 0$ can be written as

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^{k-i+1} (-1)^* \mathfrak{m}_{n-k+1}(x_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathfrak{m}_k(x_i, \cdots, x_{i+k-1}) \otimes \cdots \otimes x_n) = 0,$$

where $*$ is the same as above. In particular, we have $\mathfrak{m}_1\mathfrak{m}_1 = 0$ and so it defines a complex $(C, \mathfrak{m}_1)$.

A *weak* (or *curved*) A_∞-algebra is defined in the same way, except that it also includes the $\mathfrak{m}_0$-term $\mathfrak{m}_0 : R \to B(C[1])$. The first two terms of the A_∞ relation for a weak L_∞ algebra are given as

$$\mathfrak{m}_1(\mathfrak{m}_0(1)) = 0, \quad \mathfrak{m}_1\mathfrak{m}_1(x) + (-1)^{\deg x+1}\mathfrak{m}_2(x, \mathfrak{m}_0(1)) + \mathfrak{m}_2(\mathfrak{m}_0(1), x) = 0.$$

In particular, for the case of weak A_∞ algebras, $\mathfrak{m}_1$ will not satisfy boundary property, i.e., $\mathfrak{m}_1\mathfrak{m}_1 \neq 0$ in general.

We now recall the notion of *unit* in A_∞ algebra.

Definition 3.2. An element $\mathbf{e} \in C^0 = C[1]^{-1}$ is called a unit if it satisfies

(1) $\mathfrak{m}_{k+1}(x_1, \cdots, \mathbf{e}, \cdots, x_k) = 0$ for $k \geq 2$ or $k = 0$.
(2) $\mathfrak{m}_2(\mathbf{e}, x) = (-1)^{\deg x}\mathfrak{m}_2(x, \mathbf{e}) = x$ for all x.

Combining this definition of unit and (3.1), we have the following immediate lemma.

Lemma 3.3. *Consider an A_∞ algebra $(C[1], \mathfrak{m})$ over a ground ring R for which $\mathfrak{m}_0(1) = \lambda\mathbf{e}$ for some $\lambda \in R$. Then $\mathfrak{m}_1\mathfrak{m}_1 = 0$.*

Now we explain the notion of the *filtered A_∞ algebra*. We define the *universal Novikov ring* $\Lambda_{0,nov}$ by

$$\Lambda_{0,nov} = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_i T^{\lambda_i} e^{n_i} \;\middle|\; a_i \in R, n_i \in \mathbb{Z}, \lambda_i \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, \lim_{i\to\infty} \lambda_i = \infty \right\}.$$

This is a graded ring by defining $\deg T = 0$, $\deg e = 2$. Let $\Lambda_{0,nov}^+$ be its maximal ideal which consists of the elements $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_i T^{\lambda_i} e^{n_i}$ with $\lambda_i > 0$.

Let $\bigoplus_{m\in\mathbb{Z}} C^m$ be the free graded $\Lambda_{0,nov}$ module over the basis $\{\mathbf{v}_i\}$. We define a filtration $\bigoplus_{m\in\mathbb{Z}} F^\lambda C^m$ on it such that $\{T^\lambda \mathbf{v}_i\}$ is a free basis of $\bigoplus_{m\in\mathbb{Z}} F^\lambda C^m$. Here $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, $\lambda \geq 0$. We call this filtration the *energy filtration*. (Our algebra $\bigoplus_{m\in\mathbb{Z}} C^m$ may not be finitely generated. So we need to take completion.) We denote by C the completion of $\bigoplus_{m\in\mathbb{Z}} C^m$ with respect to the energy filtration. The filtration induces a natural non-Archimedean topology on C.

A *filtered A_∞ algebra* $(C, \mathfrak{m})$ is a weak A_∞ algebra such that A_∞ operators $\mathfrak{m}$ have the following properties :

(1) $\mathfrak{m}_k$ respect the energy filtration,
(2) $\mathfrak{m}_0(1) \in F^\lambda C^1$ with $\lambda > 0$,

(3) The reduction $\mathfrak{m}_k \mod \Lambda_{0,nov}^+ : B_k\overline{C}[1] \otimes R[e,e^{-1}] \to \overline{C} \otimes R[e,e^{-1}]$ does not contain e. More precisely speaking, it has the form $\overline{\mathfrak{m}}_k \otimes {}_R R[e,e^{-1}]$ where $\overline{\mathfrak{m}}_k : B_k\overline{C}[1] \to \overline{C}$ is an R module homomorphism. (Here $\overline{C}$ is the free R module over the basis $\mathbf{v}_i$.)

(See Definition 3.2.20 [FOOO3] = Definition 7.20 [FOOO2].)

Remark 3.4. (1) In [FOOO3] we assume $\mathfrak{m}_0 = 0$ for (unfiltered) A_∞ algebra. On the other hand, $\mathfrak{m}_0 = 0$ is not assumed for filtered A_∞ algebra. Filtered A_∞ algebra satisfying $\mathfrak{m}_0 = 0$ is called to be *strict*.

(2) In this section, to be consistent with the exposition given in [FOOO3], we use the Novikov ring $\Lambda_{0,nov}$ which includes the variable e. In [FOOO3], the variable e is used so that the operations $\mathfrak{m}_k$ become to have degree one for all k (with respect to the shifted degree.) But for the applications of this paper, it is enough to use the $\mathbb{Z}_2$-grading and so encoding the degree with a formal parameter is not necessary. Therefore we will use the ring Λ_0 in other sections, which does not contain e. An advantage of using the ring Λ_0 is that it is a local ring while $\Lambda_{0,nov}$ is not. This makes it easier to use some standard results from commutative algebra in later sections. We would like to remark that as a $\mathbb{Z}_2$ graded complex a $\mathbb{Z}$ graded complex over $\Lambda_{0,nov}$ is equivalent to the complex over Λ_0.

Next we explain how one can deform the given filtered A_∞ algebra $(C,\mathfrak{m})$ by an element $b \in F^\lambda C[1]^0$ with $\lambda > 0$, by re-defining the A_∞ operators as

$$\mathfrak{m}_k^b(x_1,\cdots,x_k) = \mathfrak{m}(e^b,x_1,e^b,x_2,e^b,x_3,\cdots,x_k,e^b).$$

This defines a new weak A_∞-algebra for arbitrary b.

Here we simplify notations by writing $e^b = 1 + b + b\otimes b + \cdots + b\otimes\cdots\otimes b + \cdots$. Note that each summand in this infinite sum has degree 0 in $C[1]$. When the ground ring is $\Lambda_{0,nov}$, the infinite sum will converge in the non-Archimedean topology since $b \in F^\lambda C[1]^0$ with $\lambda > 0$

Proposition 3.5. *For A_∞ algebra $(C,\mathfrak{m}_k^b)$, $\mathfrak{m}_0^b \equiv 0 \mod \Lambda_{0,nov}\{\mathbf{e}\}$ if and only if b satisfies*

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathfrak{m}_k(b,\cdots,b) \equiv 0 \mod \Lambda_{0,nov}\{\mathbf{e}\}. \tag{3.2}$$

We call the equation (3.2) the A_∞ *Maurer-Cartan equation*.

Definition 3.6. Let $(C,\mathfrak{m})$ be a filtered A_∞ algebra in general and $BC[1]$ be its bar-complex. An element $b \in F^\lambda C[1]^0$ $(\lambda > 0)$ is called a *weak bounding cochain* if it satisfies the equation (3.2). If the b satisfies the strict equation

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathfrak{m}_k(b,\cdots,b) = 0$$

we call it a (strict) *bounding cochain*.

From now on, we will also call a weak bounding cochain just a bounding cochain since we will mainly concern weak bounding cochains. In general a given A_∞ algebra may or may not have a solution to (3.2).

Definition 3.7. A filtered A_∞-algebra is called *weakly unobstructed* if the equation (3.2) has a solution $b \in F^\lambda C[1]^0$ with $\lambda > 0$.

One can define a notion of gauge equivalence between two bounding cochains as described in section 4.3 [FOOO3] (=section 16 [FOOO2]).

The way how a filtered A_∞ algebra is attached to a Lagrangian submanifold $L \subset (M, \omega)$ arises as an A_∞ deformation of the classical singular cochain complex including the instanton contributions. In particular, when there is no instanton contribution as in the case $\pi_2(M, L) = 0$, it will reduce to an A_∞ deformation of the singular cohomology in the chain level including all possible higher Massey products.

We now describe the basic A_∞ operators $\mathfrak{m}_k$ in the context of A_∞ algebra of Lagrangian submanifolds. For a given compatible almost complex structure J, consider the moduli space $\mathcal{M}_{k+1}(\beta; L)$ of stable maps of genus zero. It is a compactification of

$$\{(w, (z_0, z_1, \cdots, z_k)) \mid \overline{\partial}_J w = 0,\, z_i \in \partial D^2,\, [w] = \beta \ \text{in}\, \pi_2(M, L)\}/\sim$$

where $\sim$ is the conformal reparameterization of the disc D^2. The expected dimension of this space is given by $n + \mu(\beta) - 3 + (k + 1) = n + \mu(\beta) + k - 2$.

Now given k singular chains $[P_1, f_1], \cdots, [P_k, f_k] \in C_*(L)$ of L, we put the cohomological grading $\deg P_i = n - \dim P_i$ and regard the chain complex $C_*(L)$ as the cochain complex $C^{\dim L - *}(L)$. We consider the fiber product

$$ev_0 : \mathcal{M}_{k+1}(\beta; L) \times_{(ev_1, \cdots, ev_k)} (P_1 \times \cdots \times P_k) \to L,$$

where $ev_i([w, (z_0, z_1, \cdots, z_k)]) = w(z_i)$.

A simple calculation shows that we have the expected degree

$$\deg \left[\mathcal{M}_{k+1}(\beta; L) \times_{(ev_1, \cdots, ev_k)} (P_1 \times \cdots \times P_k), ev_0\right] = \sum_{j=1}^{n} (\deg P_j - 1) + 2 - \mu(\beta).$$

For each given $\beta \in \pi_2(M, L)$ and $k = 0, \cdots$, we define

$$\mathfrak{m}_{k,\beta}(P_1, \cdots, P_k) = \left[\mathcal{M}_{k+1}(\beta; L) \times_{(ev_1, \cdots, ev_k)} (P_1 \times \cdots \times P_k), ev_0\right] \tag{3.3}$$

and $\mathfrak{m}_k = \sum_{\beta \in \pi_2(M,L)} \mathfrak{m}_{k,\beta} \cdot T^{\omega(\beta)} e^{\mu(\beta)/2}$.

Now we denote by $C[1]$ the completion of a *suitably chosen countably generated* (singular) chain complex with $\Lambda_{0,nov}$ as its coefficients with respect to the non-Archimedean topology. (We regard $C[1]$ as a *cochain* complex.) Then by choosing a system of multivalued perturbations of the right hand side of (3.3) and a triangulation of its zero sets, the map $\mathfrak{m}_k : B_k(C[1]) \to C[1]$ is defined, has degree 1 and continuous with respect to non-Archimedean topology. We extend $\mathfrak{m}_k$ as a coderivation $\widehat{\mathfrak{m}}_k : BC[1] \to BC[1]$ by (3.1). Finally we take the sum

$$\widehat{d} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \widehat{\mathfrak{m}}_k : BC[1] \to BC[1]. \tag{3.4}$$

A main theorem proven in [FOOO1, FOOO3] then is the following coboundary property

Theorem 3.8. (Theorem 3.5.11 [FOOO3] = Theorem 10.11 [FOOO2]) *Let L be an arbitrary compact relatively spin Lagrangian submanifold of an arbitrary tame symplectic manifold (M, ω). The coderivation $\widehat{d}$ is a continuous map that satisfies the A_∞ relation $\widehat{d}\widehat{d} = 0$.*

The A_∞ algebra associated to L in this way has the *homotopy unit*, not a *unit*. In general a filtered A_∞ algebra with homotopy unit canonically induces another filtered *unital* A_∞-algebra called a *canonical model* of the given filtered A_∞ algebra. In the geometric context of A_∞ algebra associated to a Lagrangian submanifold $L \subset M$ of a general symplectic manifold (M, ω), the canonical model is defined on the cohomology group $H^*(L; \Lambda_{0,nov})$. We refer to [FOOO5] for a quick explanation of construction by summing over trees of this canonical model.

Once the A_∞ algebra is attached to each Lagrangian submanifold L, we then construct a filtered A_∞ *bimodule* $C(L, L')$ for the transversal pair of Lagrangian submanifolds L and L'. Here $C(L, L')$ is the free $\Lambda_{0,nov}$ module such that the set of its basis is identified with $L \cap L'$. The filtered A_∞ bimodule structure is by definition is a family of operators

$$\mathfrak{n}_{k_1,k_2} : B_{k_1}(C(L)[1]) \,\widehat{\otimes}_{\Lambda_{0,nov}}\, C(L, L') \,\widehat{\otimes}_{\Lambda_{0,nov}}\, B_{k_1}(C(L')[1]) \to C(L, L')$$

for $k_1, k_2 \geq 0$. (Here $\widehat{\otimes}_{\Lambda_{0,nov}}$ is the completion of algebraic tensor product.) Let us briefly describe the definition of $\mathfrak{n}_{k_1,k_2}$. A typical element of the tensor product $B_{k_1}(C(L)[1]) \,\widehat{\otimes}_{\Lambda_{0,nov}}\, C(L, L') \,\widehat{\otimes}_{\Lambda_{0,nov}}\, B_{k_2}(C(L')[1])$ has the form

$$P_{1,1} \otimes \cdots, \otimes P_{1,k_1} \otimes \langle p \rangle \otimes P_{2,1} \otimes \cdots \otimes P_{2,k_2}$$

with $p \in L \cap L'$. Then the image $\mathfrak{n}_{k_1,k_2}$ thereof is given by

$$\sum_{q,B} T^{\omega(B)} e^{\mu(B)/2} \#\left(\mathcal{M}(p, q; B; P_{1,1}, \cdots, P_{1,k_1}; P_{2,1}, \cdots, P_{2,k_2})\right) \langle q \rangle.$$

Here B denotes homotopy class of Floer trajectories connecting p and q, the summation is taken over all (q, B) with

$$\text{vir.dim } \mathcal{M}(p, q; B; P_{1,1}, \cdots, P_{1,k_1}; P_{2,1}, \cdots, P_{2,k_2}) = 0,$$

and $\#\left(\mathcal{M}(p, q; B; P_{1,1}, \cdots, P_{1,k_1}; P_{2,1}, \cdots, P_{2,k_2})\right)$ is the 'number' of elements in the 'zero' dimensional moduli space $\mathcal{M}(p, q; B; P_{1,1}, \cdots, P_{1,k_1}; P_{2,1}, \cdots, P_{2,k_2})$. Here the moduli space $\mathcal{M}(p, q; B; P_{1,1}, \cdots, P_{1,k_1}; P_{2,1}, \cdots, P_{2,k_2})$ is the Floer moduli space $\mathcal{M}(p, q; B)$ cut-down by intersecting with the given chains $P_{1,i} \subset L$ and $P_{2,j} \subset L'$.

Theorem 3.9. (Theorem 3.7.21 [FOOO3] = Theorem 12.21 [FOOO2]) *Let (L, L') be an arbitrary relatively spin pair of compact Lagrangian submanifolds. Then the family $\{\mathfrak{n}_{k_1,k_2}\}$ define a left $(C(L), \mathfrak{m})$ and right $(C(L'), \mathfrak{m}')$ filtered A_∞-bimodule structure on $C(L, L')$.*

What this theorem means is explained below as Proposition 3.10.

Let $B(C(L)[1]) \,\widehat{\otimes}_{\Lambda_{0,nov}}\, C(L, L') \,\widehat{\otimes}_{\Lambda_{0,nov}}\, B(C(L')[1])$ be the completion of the direct sum of $B_{k_1}(C(L)[1]) \,\widehat{\otimes}_{\Lambda_{0,nov}}\, C(L, L') \,\widehat{\otimes}_{\Lambda_{0,nov}}\, B_{k_2}(C(L')[1])$ over $k_1 \geq 0$, $k_2 \geq 0$. We define the boundary operator $\widehat{d}$ on it by using the maps $\mathfrak{n}_{k_1,k_2}$ and $\mathfrak{m}_k$, $\mathfrak{m}'_k$ as

follows :

$$\begin{aligned}
&\widehat{d}((x_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes x_n) \otimes x \otimes (x'_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes x'_m)) \\
&= \widehat{d}(x_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes x_n) \otimes x \otimes (x'_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes x'_m) \\
&\quad + (-1)^{\deg x_1 + \cdots + \deg x_n + \deg x + n + 1}(x_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes x_n) \otimes x \otimes \widehat{d}(x'_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes x'_m) \\
&\quad + \sum_{k_1 \le n} \sum_{k_2 \le m} (-1)^{\deg x_1 + \cdots + \deg x_{n-k_1} + n - k_1}(x_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes x_{n-k_1}) \\
&\qquad\qquad \otimes \mathfrak{n}_{k_1,k_2}((x_{n-k_1+1} \otimes \cdots \otimes x_n) \otimes x \otimes (x'_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes x'_{k_2})) \\
&\qquad\qquad \otimes (x'_{k_2+1} \otimes \cdots \otimes x'_m).
\end{aligned}$$

Here $\widehat{d}$ in the second and the third lines are induced from $\mathfrak{m}$ and $\mathfrak{m}'$ by Formula (3.4) respectively.

Proposition 3.10. *The map $\widehat{d}$ satisfies $\widehat{d}\,\widehat{d} = 0$.*

The A_∞ bimodule structure, which define a boundary operator on the bar complex, induces an operator $\delta = \mathfrak{n}_{0,0}$ on a much smaller, ordinary free $\Lambda_{0,nov}$ module $C(L, L')$ generated by the intersections $L \cap L'$. However the boundary property of this Floer's 'boundary' map δ again meets obstruction coming from the obstructions cycles of either L, L' or of both. We need to deform δ using suitable bounding cochains of L, L'.

In the case where both L, L' are weakly unobstructed, we can carry out this deformation of $\mathfrak{n}$ using weak bounding chains b and b' of fibered A_∞ algebras associated to L and L' respectively, in a way similar to $\mathfrak{m}^b$. Namely we define $\delta_{b,b'} : C(L, L') \to C(L, L')$ by

$$\delta_{b,b'}(x) = \sum_{k_1,k_2} \mathfrak{n}_{k_1,k_2}(b^{\otimes k_1} \otimes x \otimes b'^{\otimes k_2}) = \widehat{\mathfrak{n}}(e^b, x, e^{b'}).$$

We can generalize the story to the case where L has clean intersection with L', especially to the case $L = L'$. In the case $L = L'$ we have $\mathfrak{n}_{k_1,k_2} = \mathfrak{m}_{k_1+k_2+1}$. So in this case, we have $\delta_{b,b'}(x) = \mathfrak{m}(e^b, x, e^{b'})$.

In general $\delta_{b,b'}$ does not satisfy the equation $\delta_{b,b'}\delta_{b,b'} = 0$. It turns out that there is an elegant condition for $\delta_{b,b'}\delta_{b,b'} = 0$ to hold in terms of the *potential function* introduced in [FOOO3], which we explain in the next section. In the case $\delta_{b,b'}\delta_{b,b'} = 0$ we define Floer cohomology by

$$HF((L, b), (L', b'); \Lambda_{0,nov}) = \operatorname{Ker} \delta_{b,b'} / \operatorname{Im} \delta_{b,b'}.$$

Let Λ_{nov} be the field of fraction of $\Lambda_{0,nov}$. We define $HF((L, b), (L', b'); \Lambda_{nov})$ by extending the coefficient ring $\Lambda_{0,nov}$ to Λ_{nov}. Then $HF((L, b), (L', b'); \Lambda_{nov})$ is invariant under the Hamiltonian isotopies of L and L'. Therefore we can use it to obtain the following result about non-displacement of Lagrangian submanifolds.

Theorem 3.11. (Theorem G [FOOO3] = Theorem G [FOOO2]) *Assume $\delta_{b,b'}\delta_{b,b'} = 0$. Let $\psi : X \to X$ be a Hamiltonian diffeomorphism such that $\psi(L)$ is transversal to L'. Then we have*

$$\#(\psi(L) \cap L') \ge \operatorname{rank}_{\Lambda_{nov}} HF((L, b), (L', b'); \Lambda_{nov}).$$

The Floer cohomology $HF((L, b), (L', b'); \Lambda_{0,nov})$ with coefficient $\Lambda_{0,nov}$ is not invariant under the Hamiltonian isotopy. We however can prove the following Theorem 3.12. There exists an integer a and positive numbers λ_i $(i = 1, \cdots, b)$ such

that

$$HF((L,b),(L',b');\Lambda_{0,nov}) = \Lambda_{0,nov}^{\oplus a} \oplus \bigoplus_{i=1}^{b} (\Lambda_{0,nov}/T^{\lambda_i}\Lambda_{0,nov}).$$

(See Theorem 6.1.20 [FOOO3] (= Theorem 24.20 [FOOO2]).) Let $\psi : X \to X$ be a Hamiltonian diffeomorphism and $\|\psi\|$ is its Hofer distance (see [H]) from the identity map.

Theorem 3.12. (Theorem J [FOOO3] = Theorem J [FOOO2]) *If $\psi(L)$ is transversal to L', we have an inequality*

$$\#(\psi(L) \cap L') \geq a + 2\,\#\{i \mid \lambda_i \geq \|\psi\|\}.$$

In later sections, we will apply Theorems 3.11,3.12 to study non-displacement of Lagrangian fibers of toric manifolds.

4. Potential function

The A_∞ structure defined on a countably generated chain complex $C(L,\Lambda_0)$ itself explained in the previous section is not suitable for explicit calculations as in our study of toric manifolds. For this computational purpose, we work with the filtered A_∞ structure on the canonical model defined on $H(L;\Lambda_0)$ which has a *finite* rank over Λ_0. Furthermore this has a strict unit $\mathbf{e}$ given by the dual of the fundamental class $PD([L])$. Recall $C(L,\Lambda_0)$ itself has only a homotopy-unit.

An element $b \in H^1(L;\Lambda_+)$ is called a *weak bounding cochain* if it satisfies the A_∞ Maurer-Cartan equation

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathfrak{m}_k(b,\cdots,b) \equiv 0 \mod PD([L]) \tag{4.1}$$

where $\{\mathfrak{m}_k\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ is the A_∞ operators associated to L. $[L] \in H_n(L)$ is the fundamental class, and $PD([L]) \in H^0(L)$ is its Poincaré dual. We denote by $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{\mathrm{weak}}(L)$ the set of weak bounding cochains of L. We say L is *weakly unobstructed* if $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{\mathrm{weak}}(L) \neq \emptyset$. The moduli space $\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{weak}}(L)$ is then defined to be the quotient space of $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{\mathrm{weak}}(L)$ by suitable gauge equivalence. (See chapter 3 and 4 [FOOO3] for more explanations.)

Lemma 4.1 (Lemma 3.6.32 [FOOO3] = Lemma 11.32 [FOOO2])**.** *If $b \in \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{\mathrm{weak}}(L)$ then $\delta_{b,b} \circ \delta_{b,b} = 0$, where $\delta_{b,b}$ is the deformed Floer operator defined by*

$$\delta_{b,b}(x) = \mathfrak{m}_1^b(x) =: \sum_{k,\ell \geq 0} \mathfrak{m}_{k+\ell+1}(b^{\otimes k}, x, b^{\otimes \ell}).$$

For $b \in \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{\mathrm{weak}}(L)$, we define

$$HF((L;b),(L;b)) = \frac{\mathrm{Ker}(\delta_{b,b} : C \to C)}{\mathrm{Im}(\delta_{b,b} : C \to C)},$$

where C is an appropriate subcomplex of the singular chain complex of L. When L is weakly unobstructed i.e., $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{\mathrm{weak}}(C) \neq \emptyset$, we define a function

$$\mathfrak{PO} : \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{\mathrm{weak}}(C) \to \Lambda_+$$

by the equation

$$\mathfrak{m}(e^b) = \mathfrak{PO}(b) \cdot PD([L]).$$

This is the *potential function* introduced in [FOOO3].

Theorem 4.2 (Proposition 3.7.17 [FOOO3] = Proposition 12.17 [FOOO2]). *For each $b \in \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{\mathrm{weak}}(L)$ and $b' \in \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{weak}(L')$, the map $\delta_{b,b'}$ defines a continuous map $\delta_{b,b'} : CF(L,L') \to CF(L,L')$ that satisfies $\delta_{b,b'}\delta_{b,b'} = 0$, provided*

$$\mathfrak{PO}(b) = \mathfrak{PO}(b'). \tag{4.2}$$

Therefore for each pair (b,b') of $b \in \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{\mathrm{weak}}(L)$ and $b' \in \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{\mathrm{weak}}(L')$ that satisfy (4.2), we define the (b,b')-*Floer cohomology* of the pair (L,L') by

$$HF((L,b),(L',b');\Lambda_{nov}) = \frac{\mathrm{Ker}\delta_{b,b'}}{\mathrm{Im}\ \delta_{b,b'}}.$$

Now in the rest of this section we state the main results concerning the detailed structure of the potential function for the case of Lagrangian fibers of toric manifolds.

For the later analysis of examples, we recall from [FOOO1, FOOO3] that $\mathfrak{m}_k$ is further decomposed into

$$\mathfrak{m}_k = \sum_{\beta \in \pi_2(M,L)} \mathfrak{m}_{k,\beta} \otimes T^{\omega(\beta)} e^{\mu(\beta)/2}.$$

Here μ is the Maslov index.

Firstly we remove the grading parameter e from the ground ring. Secondly to eliminate many appearance of 2π in front of the affine function ℓ_i in the exponents of the parameter T later in this paper, we redefine T as $T^{2\pi}$. Under this arrangement, we get the formal power series expansion

$$\mathfrak{m}_k = \sum_{\beta \in \pi_2(M,L)} \mathfrak{m}_{k,\beta} \otimes T^{\omega(\beta)/2\pi} \tag{4.3}$$

which we will use throughout the paper.

Now we restrict to the case of toric manifold. Let $X = X_\Sigma$ be associated a complete regular fan Σ (in other words Σ is the normal fan of X), and $\pi : X \to \mathfrak{t}^*$ be the moment map of the action of the torus $T^n \cong T^m/K$. We make the identifications

$$\mathfrak{t} = Lie(T^n) \cong N^n_{\mathbb{R}} \cong \mathbb{R}^n,\ \mathfrak{t}^* \cong M_{\mathbb{R}} \cong (\mathbb{R}^n)^*.$$

We will exclusively use $N_{\mathbb{R}}$ and $M_{\mathbb{R}}$ to be consistent with the standard notations in toric geometry instead of $\mathfrak{t}$ (or $\mathbb{R}^n$) and $\mathfrak{t}^*$ (or $(\mathbb{R}^n)^*$) as much as possible.

Denote the image of $\pi : X \to M_{\mathbb{R}}$ by $P \subset M_{\mathbb{R}}$ which is the moment polytope of the T^n action on X.

We will prove the following in section 11.

Proposition 4.3. *For any $u \in \mathrm{Int}P$, the fiber $L(u)$ is weakly unobstructed. Moreover we have the canonical inclusion*

$$H^1(L(u);\Lambda_+) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{weak}}(L(u)).$$

Choose an integral basis $\mathbf{e}_i^*$ of N and $\mathbf{e}_i$ be its dual basis on M. With this choice made, we identify $M_{\mathbb{R}}$ with $\mathbb{R}^n$ as long as its meaning is obvious from the context. Identifying $H_1(T^n;\mathbb{Z})$ with $N \cong \mathbb{Z}^n$ via $T^n = \mathbb{R}^n/\mathbb{Z}^n$, we regard $\mathbf{e}_i$ as a basis of $H^1(L(u);\mathbb{Z})$. The following immediately follows from definition.

Lemma 4.4. *We write $\pi = (\pi_1, \cdots, \pi_n) : X \to M_{\mathbb{R}}$ using the coordinate of $M_{\mathbb{R}}$ associated to the basis $\mathbf{e}_i$. Let $S^1_i \subset T^n$ be the subgroup whose orbit represents $\mathbf{e}_i^* \in H_1(T^n;\mathbb{Z})$. Then π_i is proportional to the moment map of S^1_i action on X.*

Let

$$b = \sum x_i \mathbf{e}_i \in H^1(L(u); \Lambda_+) \subset \mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{weak}}(L(u)).$$

We study the potential function

$$\mathfrak{PO} : H^1(L(u); \Lambda_+) \to \Lambda_+.$$

Once a choice of the family of bases $\{\mathbf{e}_i\}$ on $H^1(L(u); \mathbb{Z})$ for $u \in \operatorname{Int} P$ is made as above starting from a basis on N , then we can regard this function as a function of $(x_1, \cdots, x_n) \in (\Lambda_+)^n$ and $(u_1, \cdots, u_n) \in P \subset M_{\mathbb{R}}$. We denote its value by $\mathfrak{PO}(x; u) = \mathfrak{PO}(x_1, \cdots, x_n; u_1, \cdots, u_n)$. We put

$$y_i = e^{x_i} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{x_i^k}{k!} \in \Lambda_0.$$

Let

$$\partial P = \bigcup_{i=1}^{m} \partial_i P$$

be the decomposition of the boundary of the moment polytope into its faces of codimension one. ($\partial_i P$ is a polygon in an $n-1$ dimensional affine subspace of $M_{\mathbb{R}}$.)

Let ℓ_i be the affine functions

$$\ell_i(u) = \langle u, v_i \rangle - \lambda_i \text{ for } i = 1, \cdots, m$$

appearing in Theorem 2.13. Then the followings hold from construction :

(1) $\ell_i \equiv 0$ on $\partial_i P$.
(2) $P = \{u \in M_{\mathbb{R}} \mid \ell_i(u) \geq 0, i = 1, \cdots, m\}$.
(3) The coordinates of the vectors $v_i = (v_{i,1}, \cdots, v_{i,n})$ satisfy

$$v_{i,j} = \frac{\partial \ell_i}{\partial u_j} \tag{4.4}$$

and are all integers.

Theorem 4.5. *Let $L(u) \subset X$ be as in Theorem 1.5 and ℓ_i be as above. Suppose X is Fano. Then we can take the canonical model of A_∞ structure of $L(u)$ over $u \in \operatorname{Int} P$ so that the potential function restricted to*

$$\bigcup_{u \in \operatorname{Int}\ P} H^1(L(u); \Lambda_+) \cong (\Lambda_+)^n \times \operatorname{Int} P$$

has the form

$$\mathfrak{PO}(x; u) = \sum_{i=1}^{m} y_1^{v_{i,1}} \cdots y_n^{v_{i,n}} T^{\ell_i(u)} \tag{4.5}$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^{m} e^{\langle v_i, x \rangle} T^{\ell_i(u)} \tag{4.6}$$

where $(x; u) = (x_1, \cdots, x_n; u_1, \cdots, u_n)$ and $v_{i,j}$ is as in (4.4).

Theorem 4.5 is a minor improvement of a result from [CO] (see (15.1) of [CO]) and [Cho] : The case considered in [CO] corresponds to the case where $y_i \in U(1) \subset \{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid |z| = 1\}$ and the case in [Cho] corresponds to the one where $y_i \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$. The difference of Theorem 4.5 from the ones thereof is that y_i is allowed to contain T, the formal parameter of the universal Novikov ring encoding the energy.

For the non-Fano case, we prove the following slightly weaker statement. The proof will be given in section 11.

Theorem 4.6. *Let X be an arbitrary toric manifold and $L(u)$ be as above. Then there exist $c_j \in \mathbb{Q}$, $e^i_j \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and $\rho_j > 0$, such that $\sum_{i=1}^m e^i_j > 0$ and*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{PO}(x_1, \cdots, x_n; u_1, \cdots, u_n) &- \sum_{i=1}^m y_1^{v_{i,1}} \cdots y_n^{v_{i,n}} T^{\ell_i(u)} \\ &= \sum_{j=1} c_j y_1^{v'_{j,1}} \cdots y_n^{v'_{j,n}} T^{\ell'_j(u)+\rho_j}, \end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

where

$$v'_{j,k} = \sum_{i=1}^m e^i_j v_{i,k}, \quad \ell'_j = \sum_{i=1}^m e^i_j \ell_i.$$

If there are infinitely many non-zero c_j's, we have

$$\lim_{j\to\infty} \ell'_j(u) + \rho_j = \infty.$$

Moreover $\rho_j = [\omega] \cap \alpha_j$ for some $\alpha_j \in \pi_2(X)$ with nonpositive first Chern number $c_1(X) \cap [\alpha_j]$.

We note that although $\mathfrak{PO}$ is defined originally on $(\Lambda_+^{\mathbb{C}})^n \times P$, Theorems 4.5 and 4.6 imply that $\mathfrak{PO}$ extends to a function on $(\Lambda_0^{\mathbb{C}})^n \times P$ in general, and to one on $(\Lambda_0^{\mathbb{C}})^n \times M_{\mathbb{R}}$ for the Fano case. Furthermore these theorems also imply the periodicity of $\mathfrak{PO}$ in x_i's,

$$\mathfrak{PO}(x_1, \cdots, x_i + 2\pi\sqrt{-1}, \cdots, x_n; u) = \mathfrak{PO}(x_1, \cdots, x_n; u). \tag{4.8}$$

We write

$$\mathfrak{PO}_0 = \sum_{i=1}^m y_1^{v_{i,1}} \cdots y_n^{v_{i,n}} T^{\ell_i(u)} \tag{4.9}$$

to distinguish it from $\mathfrak{PO}$. We call $\mathfrak{PO}_0$ the *leading order potential function*.

We will concern the existence of the bounding cochain $\mathfrak{x}$ for which the Floer cohomology $HF((L(u), \mathfrak{x}), (L(u), \mathfrak{x}))$ is not zero, and prove that critical points of the $\mathfrak{PO}^u$ (as a function of $y_1, \cdots, y_n$) have this property. (Theorem 4.10.)

This leads us to study the equation

$$\frac{\partial \mathfrak{PO}^u}{\partial y_k}(\mathfrak{y}_1, \cdots, \mathfrak{y}_n) = 0, \qquad k = 1, \cdots, n, \tag{4.10}$$

where $\mathfrak{y}_i \in \Lambda_0 \setminus \Lambda_+$.

We regard $\mathfrak{PO}^u$ as either a function of x_i or of y_i. Since the variable (x_i or y_i) is clear from situation, we do not mention it occasionally.

Proposition 4.7. *We assume that the coordinates of the vertices of P are rational. Then there exists $u_0 \in \mathrm{Int}P \cap \mathbb{Q}^n$ such that for each $\mathcal{N}$ there exists $\mathfrak{y}_1, \cdots, \mathfrak{y}_n \in \Lambda_0 \setminus \Lambda_+$ satisfying :*

$$\frac{\partial \mathfrak{PO}^{u_0}}{\partial y_k}(\mathfrak{y}_1, \cdots, \mathfrak{y}_n) \equiv 0, \mod T^{\mathcal{N}} \qquad k = 1, \cdots, n. \tag{4.11}$$

Moreover there exists $\mathfrak{y}'_1, \cdots, \mathfrak{y}'_n \in \Lambda_0 \setminus \Lambda_+$ such that

$$\frac{\partial \mathfrak{PO}_0^{u_0}}{\partial y_k}(\mathfrak{y}'_1, \cdots, \mathfrak{y}'_n) = 0, \qquad k = 1, \cdots, n. \tag{4.12}$$

We will prove Proposition 4.7 in section 9 .

Remark 4.8. (1) u_0 is independent of $\mathcal{N}$. But $\mathfrak{y}_i$ may depend on $\mathcal{N}$. (We believe it does not depend on $\mathcal{N}$, but are unable to prove it at the time of writing this paper.)

(2) If $[\omega] \in H^2(X;\mathbb{R})$ is contained in $H^2(X;\mathbb{Q})$ then we may choose P so that its vertices are rational.

(3) We believe that rationality of the vertices of P is superfluous. We also believe there exists not only a solution of (4.11) or of (4.12) but also of (4.10). However then the proof seems to become more cumbersome. Since we can reduce the general case to the rational case by approximation in most of the applications, we will be content to prove the above weaker statement in this paper.

We put

$$\mathfrak{x}_i = \log \mathfrak{y}_i \in \Lambda_0$$

and write

$$\mathfrak{x} = \sum_i \mathfrak{x}_i \mathbf{e}_i \in H^1(L(u_0);\Lambda_0). \tag{4.13}$$

Since $\mathfrak{y}_i \in \Lambda_0 \setminus \Lambda_+$, $\log \mathfrak{y}_i$ is well-defined (by using non-Archimedean topology on Λ_0) and is contained in Λ_0.

We remark that $\mathfrak{x}_i$ is determined from $\mathfrak{y}_i$ up to addtion by an element of $2\pi\sqrt{-1}\mathbb{Z}$. It will follow from (4.8) that changing $\mathfrak{x}_i$ by an element of $2\pi\sqrt{-1}\mathbb{Z}$ does not change corresponding Floer cohomology. So we take for example $\operatorname{Im}\mathfrak{x}_i \in [0, 2\pi)$. (See also Definition 1.2 (2).)

Let $\mathfrak{y}_{i,0} \in \mathbb{C}\setminus\{0\}$ be the zero-order term of $\mathfrak{y}_i$ i.e., the complex number such that

$$\mathfrak{y}_i - \mathfrak{y}_{i,0} \equiv 0 \mod \Lambda_+^{\mathbb{C}}.$$

If we put an additional assumption that $\mathfrak{y}_{i,0} = 1$ for $i = 1, \cdots, n$, then $\mathfrak{x}$ lies in

$$H^1(L(u_0);\Lambda_+) \subset H^1(L(u_0);\Lambda_0).$$

Therefore Proposition 4.3 implies the Floer cohomology $HF((L(u_0),\mathfrak{x}),(L(u_0),\mathfrak{x});\Lambda_0)$ is defined. Then (4.11) combined with the argument from [CO] (see section 13) imply

$$HF((L(u_0),\mathfrak{x}),(L(u_0),\mathfrak{x});\Lambda_0^{\mathbb{C}}/(T^{\mathcal{N}})) \cong H(T^n;\Lambda_0^{\mathbb{C}}/(T^{\mathcal{N}})). \tag{4.14}$$

We now consider the case when $\mathfrak{y}_{i,0} \neq 1$ for some i. In this case, we follow the idea of Cho [Cho] of twisting the Floer cohomology of $L(u)$ by *non-unitary* flat line bundle and proceed as follows :

We define $\rho : H_1(L(u);\mathbb{Z}) \to \mathbb{C}\setminus\{0\}$ by

$$\rho(\mathbf{e}_i^*) = \mathfrak{y}_{i,0}. \tag{4.15}$$

Let $\mathfrak{L}_\rho$ be the flat complex line bundle on $L(u)$ whose holonomy representation is ρ. We use ρ to twist the operator $\mathfrak{m}_k$ in the same way as [Fu3], [Cho] to obtain a filtered A_∞ algebra, which we write $(H(L(u);\Lambda_0),\mathfrak{m}^\rho)$. It is weakly unobstructed and $\mathcal{M}_{\text{weak}}(H(L(u);\Lambda_0),\mathfrak{m}^\rho) \supseteq H^1(L(u);\Lambda_+)$. (See section 12.)

We deform the filtered A_∞ structure $\mathfrak{m}^\rho$ to $\mathfrak{m}^{\rho,b}$ using $b \in H^1(L(u);\Lambda_+)$ for which $\mathfrak{m}_1^{\rho,b}\mathfrak{m}_1^{\rho,b} = 0$ holds. Denote by $HF((L(u_0),\rho,b),(L(u_0),\rho,b);\Lambda_0^{\mathbb{C}})$ the cohomology of $\mathfrak{m}_1^{\rho,b}$. We denote the potential function of $(H(L(u);\Lambda_0),\mathfrak{m}^\rho)$ by

$$\mathfrak{PO}_\rho^u : H^1(L(u);\Lambda_+) \to \Lambda_+$$

which is defined in the same way as $\mathfrak{PO}^u$ by using $\mathfrak{m}^\rho$ instead of $\mathfrak{m}$.

Let $\mathfrak{x}$ be as in (4.13) and put

$$\mathfrak{x}_{i,0} = \log \mathfrak{y}_{i,0}, \qquad b = \sum (\mathfrak{x}_i - \mathfrak{x}_{i,0}) \mathbf{e}_i \in H^1(L(u); \Lambda_+). \tag{4.16}$$

From the way how the definition goes, we can easily prove

Lemma 4.9. $\mathfrak{PO}^u_\rho(b) = \mathfrak{PO}^u(\mathfrak{x})$.

We note from the remark right after Theorem 4.6 that $\mathfrak{PO}^u$ has been extended to a function on $(\Lambda_0^{\mathbb{C}})^n$ and hence the right hand side of the identity in this lemma has a well-defined meaning. Lemma 4.9 will be proved in section 13.

Now we have :

Theorem 4.10. *Let $\mathfrak{x}_i$, $\mathfrak{y}_i = e^{\mathfrak{x}_i}$, and ρ satisfy (4.10), (4.13) and (4.15). Let $\mathfrak{x}_{i,0}$ and b be as in (4.16). Then we have*

$$HF((L(u_0), \rho, b), (L(u_0), \rho, b), \Lambda_0^{\mathbb{C}}) \cong H(T^n; \Lambda_0^{\mathbb{C}}). \tag{4.17}$$

If (4.11), (4.13), (4.15) and (4.16) are satisfied instead then we have

$$HF((L(u_0), \rho, b), (L(u_0), \rho, b), \Lambda_0^{\mathbb{C}}/(T^{\mathcal{N}})) \cong H(T^n; \Lambda_0^{\mathbb{C}}/(T^{\mathcal{N}})). \tag{4.18}$$

Theorem 4.10 is proved in section 13. Using this we prove Theorem 1.5 in section 13. More precisely, we will also discuss the following two points in that section :

(1) We need to study the case where ω is not necessarily rational.
(2) We only have (4.18) instead of (4.17).

Next we give

Definition 4.11. Let (X, ω) be a smooth compact toric manifold, P be its moment polytope. We say that a fiber $L(u_0)$ at $u_0 \in P$ is *balanced* if there exists a sequence ω_i, u_i such that

(1) ω_i is a T^n invariant Kähler structure on X such that $\lim_{i\to\infty} \omega_i = \omega$.
(2) u_i is in the interior of the moment polytope P_i of (X, ω_i). We make an appropriate choice of moment polytope P_i so that they converge to P. Then $\lim_{i\to\infty} u_i = u_0$.
(3) For each $\mathcal{N}$, there exist a sufficiently large i and $\mathfrak{x}_{i,\mathcal{N}} \in H^1(L(u_i); \Lambda_0^{\mathbb{C}})$ such that

$$HF((L(u_i), \mathfrak{x}_{i,\mathcal{N}}), (L(u_i), \mathfrak{x}_{i,\mathcal{N}}); \Lambda^{\mathbb{C}}/(T^{\mathcal{N}})) \cong H(T^n; \mathbb{C}) \otimes \Lambda^{\mathbb{C}}/(T^{\mathcal{N}}).$$

We say that $L(u_0)$ is *strongly balanced* if there exists $\mathfrak{x} \in H^1(L; \Lambda_0^{\mathbb{C}})$ such that $HF((L(u_0), \mathfrak{x}), (L(u_0), \mathfrak{x}); \Lambda_0^{\mathbb{C}}) \cong H(T^n; \mathbb{Q}) \otimes \Lambda_0^{\mathbb{C}}$.

Obviously 'strongly balanced' implies 'balanced'. The converse is not true in general. See Example 10.17. We also refer readers to Remark 13.9 for other characterizations of being balanced (or strongly balanced).

Theorem 4.10 implies that $L(u_0)$ in Proposition 4.7 is balanced. (Proposition 13.2.) We will prove the next following intersection result in section 13. Theorem 1.5 will then be a consequence of Propositions 4.7 and 4.12.

Proposition 4.12. *If $L(u_0)$ is a balanced Lagrangian fiber then the following holds for any Hamiltonian diffeomorphism $\psi : X \to X$.*

$$\psi(L(u_0)) \cap L(u_0) \neq \emptyset. \tag{4.19}$$

If $\psi(L(u_0))$ is transversal to $L(u_0)$ in addition, then

$$\#(\psi(L(u_0)) \cap L(u_0)) \geq 2^n. \tag{4.20}$$

Denoting $\mathfrak{x} = b + \sum \mathfrak{x}_{i,0}\mathbf{e}_i$, we sometime write $HF((L(u_0), \mathfrak{x}), (L(u_0), \mathfrak{x}), \Lambda_0)$ for $HF((L(u_0), \rho, b), (L(u_0), \rho, b), \Lambda_0)$ from now on. We also define

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{weak}}(L(u); \Lambda_0) := \{(\rho, b) \mid \rho : \pi_1 L(u) \to \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}, b \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{weak}}(H(L(u)), \mathfrak{m}^\rho)\}.$$

Namely it is the set of pairs (ρ, b) where ρ is a holonomy of a flat $\mathbb{C}$ bundle over $L(u)$ and $b \in H(L(u); \Lambda_+)$ is a weak bounding cochain of the filtered A_∞ algebra associated to $L(u)$ and twisted by ρ. With this definition of $\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{weak}}(L(u); \Lambda_0)$, we have :

$$H^1(L(u); \Lambda_0) \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{weak}}(L(u); \Lambda_0).$$

5. Examples

In this section, we discuss various examples of toric manifolds which illustrate the results of section 4.

Example 5.1. Consider $X = S^2$ with standard symplectic form with area 2π. The moment polytope of the standard S^1-action by rotations along an axis becomes $P = [0, 1]$ after a suitable translation. We have $\ell_1(u) = u$, $\ell_2(u) = 1 - u$ and

$$\mathfrak{PO}(x; u) = e^x T^u + e^{-x} T^{1-u} = yT^u + y^{-1}T^{1-u}.$$

The zero of

$$\frac{\partial \mathfrak{PO}^u}{\partial y} = T^u - y^{-2}T^{1-u}$$

is $\mathfrak{y} = \pm T^{(1-2u)/2}$. If $u \neq 1/2$ then

$$\log \mathfrak{y} = \frac{1-2u}{2} \log(\pm T)$$

is not an element of universal Novikov ring. In particular, there is no critical point in $\Lambda_0^{\mathbb{C}} \setminus \Lambda_+^{\mathbb{C}}$.

If $u = 1/2$ then $\mathfrak{y} = \pm 1$. The case $\mathfrak{y} = 1$ corresponds to $\mathfrak{x} = 0$. We have

$$HF((L(1/2), 0), (L(1/2), 0); \Lambda_0) \cong H(S^1; \Lambda_0^{\mathbb{C}}).$$

The other case $\mathfrak{y} = -1$, corresponds to a nontrivial flat bundle on S^1.

Example 5.2. We consider $X = \mathbb{C}P^n$. Then

$$P = \{(u_1, \cdots, u_n) \mid 0 \leq u_i, u_1 + \cdots + u_n \leq 1\},$$

is a simplex. We have

$$\mathfrak{PO}(x_1, \cdots, x_n; u_1, \cdots, u_n) = \sum_{i=1}^n e^{x_i} T^{u_i} + e^{-\sum x_i} T^{1-\sum u_i}.$$

We put $u = u_0 = \left(\frac{1}{n+1}, \cdots, \frac{1}{n+1}\right)$. Then

$$\mathfrak{PO}^{u_0} = (y_1 + \cdots + y_n + y_1^{-1} y_2^{-1} \cdots y_n^{-1}) T^{1/(n+1)}.$$

Solutions of the equation (4.10) are given by

$$\mathfrak{y}_1 = \cdots = \mathfrak{y}_n = e^{2\pi k \sqrt{-1}/(n+1)}, \quad k = 0, \cdots, n.$$

Hence the conclusion of Theorem 1.5 holds for our torus. The case $k = 0$ corresponds to $b = 0$. The other cases correspond to appropriate flat bundles on T^n.

Remark 5.3. The critical values of the potential function is $(n+1)e^{2\pi\sqrt{-1}k/(n+1)}$, $k = 0, \cdots, n$.

We consider the quantum cohomology ring

$$QH(\mathbb{C}P^n; \Lambda_0) \cong \Lambda_0[z, T]/(z^{n+1} - T).$$

The first Chern class c_1 is $(n+1)z$. The eigenvalues of the operator

$$c : QH(\mathbb{C}P^n) \to QH(\mathbb{C}P^n), \alpha \mapsto c_1 \cup_Q \alpha$$

are $(n+1)e^{2\pi\sqrt{-1}k/(n+1)}$, $k = 0, \cdots, n$. It coincides with the set of critical values.

Kontsevich announced this statement at the homological mirror symmetry conference at Vienna 2006. (According to some physicists, this statement is known to them before.) See [Aur]. In our situation of Lagrangian fiber of compact toric manifolds, we can prove it by using Theorem 1.9.

In the rest of this subsection, we discuss 2 dimensional examples.

Let $\mathbf{e}_1$, $\mathbf{e}_2$ be the basis of $H^1(T^2; \mathbb{Z})$ as in Lemma 4.4. We put $\mathbf{e}_{12} = \mathbf{e}_1 \cup \mathbf{e}_2 \in H^2(T^2; \mathbb{Z})$. Let $\mathbf{e}_\emptyset$ be the standard basis of $H^0(T^2; \mathbb{Z}) \cong \mathbb{Z}$. The proof of the following proposition will be postponed until section 13.

Proposition 5.4. *Let $\mathfrak{x} = \sum \mathfrak{x}_i \mathbf{e}_i \in H^1(L(u); \Lambda_0)$, $\mathfrak{y}_i = e^{\mathfrak{x}_i}$. Then the boundary operator $\mathfrak{m}_1^{\mathfrak{x}}$ is given as follows :*

$$\begin{cases} \mathfrak{m}_1^{\mathfrak{x}}(\mathbf{e}_i) = \dfrac{\partial \mathfrak{PO}^u}{\partial y_i}(\mathfrak{y})\mathbf{e}_\emptyset, \\ \mathfrak{m}_1^{\mathfrak{x}}(\mathbf{e}_{12}) = \dfrac{\partial \mathfrak{PO}^u}{\partial y_1}(\mathfrak{y})\mathbf{e}_2 - \dfrac{\partial \mathfrak{PO}^u}{\partial y_2}(\mathfrak{y})\mathbf{e}_1, \\ \mathfrak{m}_1^{\mathfrak{x}}(\mathbf{e}_\emptyset) = 0. \end{cases} \tag{5.1}$$

We remark that we do not use the grading parameter e, which was introduced in [FOOO3]. So the boundary operator $\mathfrak{m}_1^{\mathfrak{x}}$ is of degree -1 rather than $+1$. (Note we are using cohomology notation.) In other words, our Floer cohomology is only of $\mathbb{Z}_2$ graded.

With (5.1) in our disposal, we examine various examples.

Example 5.5. We consider $M = \mathbb{C}P^2$ again. We put $u_1 = \epsilon + 1/3$, $u_2 = 1/3$. ($\epsilon > 0$.) Using (5.1) we can easily find the following isomorphism for the Floer cohomology with Λ_0 coefficients :

$$HF^{odd}((L(u), 0), (L(u), 0)) \cong HF^{even}((L(u), 0), (L(u), 0)) \cong \Lambda_0/(T^{1/3-\epsilon}).$$

Let us apply Theorem J [FOOO3] (= Theorem 3.12) in this situation. (See also Theorem 5.11 below.) We consider a Hamiltonian diffeomorphism $\psi : \mathbb{C}P^2 \to \mathbb{C}P^2$. We denote by $\|\psi\|$ the Hofer distance of ψ from identity. Then we have

$$\#(\psi(L(u)) \cap L(u)) \geq 4$$

if $\|\psi\| < 2\pi(\frac{1}{3} - \epsilon)$ and $\psi(L(u))$ is transversal to $L(u)$. We remark $\omega \cap [\mathbb{C}P^1] = 2\pi$ by (2.12).

We remark that this fact was already proved by Chekanov [Che]. (Actually the basic geometric idea behind our proof is the same as Chekanov's.)

Example 5.6. Let $M = S^2(\frac{a}{2}) \times S^2(\frac{b}{2})$, where $S^2(r)$ denotes the 2-sphere with radius r. We assume $a < b$.

Then $B = [0, a] \times [0, b]$ and we have :

$$\mathfrak{PO}(x_1, x_2; u_1, u_2) = y_1 T^{u_1} + y_2 T^{u_2} + y_1^{-1} T^{a-u_1} + y_2^{-1} T^{b-u_2}.$$

Let us take $u_1 = a/2$, $u_2 = b/2$. Then

$$\frac{\partial \mathfrak{PO}^u}{\partial y_1} = (1 - y_1^{-2}) T^{a/2}, \quad \frac{\partial \mathfrak{PO}^u}{\partial y_2} = (1 - y_2^{-2}) T^{b/2}.$$

Therefore $y_1 = \pm 1$ $y_2 = \pm 1$ are solutions of (4.10). Hence we can apply Theorem 4.10 to our torus.

We next put $u_1 = a/2$, $a < 2u_2 < b$. Then

$$\frac{\partial \mathfrak{PO}^u}{\partial y_1} = (1 - y_1^{-2}) T^{a/2}, \quad \frac{\partial \mathfrak{PO}^u}{\partial y_2} = T^{u_2} - y_2^{-2} T^{b-u_2}.$$

We put $y_1 = y_2 = 1$. Then $\frac{\partial \mathfrak{PO}^u}{\partial y_1} = 0$, $\frac{\partial \mathfrak{PO}^u}{\partial y_2} \neq 0$. We find that

$$HF^{odd}((L(u), 0), (L(u), 0)) \cong HF^{even}((L(u), 0), (L(u), 0)) \cong \Lambda_0/(T^{u_2}).$$

Let $\psi : \mathbb{C}P^2 \to \mathbb{C}P^2$ be a Hamiltonian diffeomorphism. Then, Theorem J [FOOO3] (= Theorem 3.12) implies that

$$\#(\psi(L(u)) \cap L(u)) \geq 4$$

if $\|\psi\| < 2\pi u_2$ and $\psi(L(u))$ is transversal to $L(u)$. Note there exists a pseudo-holomorphic disc with symplectic area πa ($< 2\pi u_2$). Hence our result improves a result from [Che].

Example 5.7. Let X be the two-point blow up of $\mathbb{C}P^2$. We may take its Kähler form so that the moment polytope is given by

$$P = \{(u_1, u_2) \mid -1 \leq u_1 \leq 1, -1 \leq u_2 \leq 1, u_1 + u_2 \leq 1 + \alpha\},$$

where $-1 < \alpha < 1$ depends on the choice of Kähler form. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{PO}(x_1, x_2; u_1, u_2) = {} & y_1 T^{1+u_1} + y_2 T^{1+u_2} + y_1^{-1} T^{1-u_1} \\ & + y_2^{-1} T^{1-u_2} + y_1^{-1} y_2^{-1} T^{1+\alpha-u_1-u_2}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.2}$$

Note X is Fano in our case.

(Case 1: $\alpha = 0$).

In this case X is monotone. We put $u_0 = (0, 0)$. $L(u_0)$ is a monotone Lagrangian submanifold. We have

$$\frac{\partial \mathfrak{PO}^{u_0}}{\partial y_1} = (1 - y_1^{-2} - y_1^{-2} y_2^{-1}) T, \quad \frac{\partial \mathfrak{PO}^{u_0}}{\partial y_2} = (1 - y_2^{-2} - y_1^{-1} y_2^{-2}) T.$$

The solutions of (4.10) are given by $y_2 = \frac{1}{y_1^2 - 1}$, $y_1^5 + y_1^4 - 2y_1^3 - 2y_1^2 + 1 = 0$ in $\mathbb{C}$. (There are 5 solutions.)

(Case 2: $\alpha > 0$).

We put $u_0 = (0, 0)$. Then

$$\frac{\partial \mathfrak{PO}^{u_0}}{\partial y_1} = (1 - y_1^{-2}) T - y_1^{-2} y_2^{-1} T^{1+\alpha}, \quad \frac{\partial \mathfrak{PO}^{u_0}}{\partial y_2} = (1 - y_2^{-2}) T - y_1^{-1} y_2^{-2} T^{1+\alpha}.$$

We consider, for example, the case $y_1 = y_2 = \tau$. Then (4.10) becomes

$$\tau^3 - \tau - T^\alpha = 0. \tag{5.3}$$

The solution of (5.3) with $\tau \equiv 1 \mod \Lambda_+$ is given by

$$\tau = 1 + \frac{1}{2}T^{\alpha} - \frac{3}{8}T^{2\alpha} + \frac{1}{2}T^{3\alpha} + \sum_{k=4}^{\infty} c_k T^{k\alpha}.$$

Let us put $\mathfrak{x} = x_1\mathbf{e}_1 + x_2\mathbf{e}_2$ with

$$x_1 = x_2 = \log\left(1 + \frac{1}{2}T^{\alpha} - \frac{3}{8}T^{2\alpha} + \frac{1}{2}T^{3\alpha} + \cdots\right) \in \Lambda_+.$$

Then by Theorem 4.10 we have

$$HF((L(u_0), \mathfrak{x}), (L(u_0), \mathfrak{x}); \Lambda_0) \cong H(T^2; \Lambda_0).$$

We like to point out that in this example it is essential to deform Floer cohomology using an element $\mathfrak{x}$ of $H^1(L(u_0); \Lambda_+)$ containing the formal parameter T to obtain nonzero Floer cohomology.

At u_0, there are actually 4 solutions such that

$$(y_1, y_2) \equiv (1,1), (1,-1), (-1,1), (-1,-1) \mod \Lambda_+,$$

respectively.

In the current case there is another point $u_0' = (\alpha, \alpha) \in P$ at which $L(u_0')$ is balanced [1]. In fact at $u_0' = (\alpha, \alpha)$ the equation (5.3) becomes

$$0 = -(y_1^{-2}y_2^{-1} + y_1^{-2})T^{1-\alpha} + T^{1+\alpha}, \quad 0 = -(y_1^{-1}y_2^{-2} + y_2^{-2})T^{1-\alpha} + T^{1+\alpha}.$$

we put $\tau = y_1 = y_2$ to obtain

$$\tau^3 T^{2\alpha} - \tau - 1 = 0$$

This equation has a unique solution with $\tau \equiv -1 \mod \Lambda_+$. (The other solution is $T^{2\alpha}\tau^3 \equiv 1 \mod \Lambda_+$, for which Theorem 4.10 is not applicable.)

The total number of the solutions $(\mathfrak{x}, u)$ is 5.

(Case 3: $\alpha < 0$).

We first consider $u_0 = (0,0)$. Then

$$\frac{\partial \mathfrak{PO}^{u_0}}{\partial y_1} = -y_1^{-2}y_2^{-1}T^{1+\alpha} + (1 - y_1^{-2})T, \quad \frac{\partial \mathfrak{PO}^{u_0}}{\partial y_2} = -y_1^{-1}y_2^{-2}T^{1+\alpha} + (1 - y_2^{-2})T.$$

We assume y_i satisfies (4.10). It is then easy to see that $y_1^{-1} \equiv 0$, or $y_2^{-1} \equiv 0 \mod \Lambda_+$. In other words, there is no (y_1, y_2) to which we can apply Theorem 4.10. Actually it is easy to find a Hamiltonian diffeomorphism $\psi : X \to X$ such that $\psi(L(u_0)) \cap L(u_0) = \emptyset$.

We next take $u_0' = (\alpha/3, \alpha/3)$. Then

$$\frac{\partial \mathfrak{PO}^{u_0'}}{\partial y_1} = (1 - y_1^{-2}y_2^{-1})T^{1+\alpha/3} - y_1^{-2}T^{1-\alpha/3},$$
$$\frac{\partial \mathfrak{PO}^{u_0'}}{\partial y_2} = (1 - y_1^{-1}y_2^{-2})T^{1+\alpha/3} - y_2^{-2}T^{1-\alpha/3}.$$

By putting $y_1 = y_2 = \tau$ for example, (4.10) becomes

$$\tau^3 - T^{-2\alpha/3}\tau - 1 = 0. \tag{5.4}$$

[1] Using the method of spectral invariants and symplectic quasi-states, Entov and Polterovich discovered some non-displaceable Lagrangian fiber which was not covered by the criterion given in [CO] (see section 9 [EP1]). Recently this example, among others, was explained by Cho [Cho] via Lagrangian Floer cohomology twisted by non-unitary line bundles.

Let us put $\mathfrak{x} = x_1\mathbf{e}_1 + x_2\mathbf{e}_2$ with

$$x_1 = x_2 = \log\tau = \log\left(1 + \frac{1}{3}T^{-2\alpha/3} - \frac{1}{81}T^{-6\alpha/3} + \cdots\right) \in \Lambda_+,$$

where τ solves (5.4). Theorem 4.10 is applicable. (There are actually 3 solutions of (4.10) corresponding to the 3 solutions of (5.4).)

There are two more points $u = (\alpha+1, \alpha), (\alpha, \alpha+1)$ where (4.10) has a solution in $(\Lambda_0 \setminus \Lambda_+)$. Each u has one solution b.

Thus the total number of the pair $(\mathfrak{x}, u)$ is again 5. We remark

$$5 = \sum \operatorname{rank} H^k(X; \mathbb{Q}).$$

This is not just a coincidence but an example of general phenomenon stated as in Theorem 1.3.

We remark that as $\alpha \to 1$ our X blows down to $S^2(1) \times S^2(1)$. On the other hand, as $\alpha \to -1$ our X blows down to $\mathbb{C}P^2$. The situation of the case $\alpha > 0$ can be regarded as a perturbation of the situation of $S^2(1) \times S^2(1)$, by the effect of exceptional curve corresponding to the segment $u_1 + u_2 = 1 + \alpha$. The situation of the case $\alpha < 0$ can be regarded as a perturbation of the situation of $\mathbb{C}P^2$ by the effect of the two exceptional curves corresponding to the segments $u_1 = 1$ and $u_2 = 1$. An interesting phase change occurs at $\alpha = 0$.

We remark that $H^2(X; \mathbb{R})$ is two dimensional. So there are actually two parameter family of symplectic structures. We study two points blow up of $\mathbb{C}P^2$ more in Example 10.17.

The discussion of this section strongly suggests that Lagrangian Floer theory (Theorems G, J [FOOO3] = Theorems 3.11, 3.12) gives the optimal result for the study of non-displacement of Lagrangian fibers in toric manifolds.

Remark 5.8. Let X be a compact toric manifold and $L(u) = \pi^{-1}(u)$, $u \in \mathrm{Int}P$. We consider the following two conditions :

(1) There exists no Hamiltonian diffeomorphism $\psi : X \to X$ such that $\psi(L(u)) \cap L(u) = \emptyset$.
(2) $L(u)$ is balanced.

(2) $\Rightarrow$ (1) follows from Proposition 4.12. In many cases (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2) can be proved by the method of [Mc]. However there is a case (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2) does not follow, as we will mention in Remark 10.18 and will prove in a sequel of this series of papers, using the bulk deformation of Lagrangian Floer cohomology. We conjecture that after including this wider class of Floer cohomology, we can detect all the non-displacable Lagrangian fibers in toric manifolds, by Floer cohomology.

Using the argument employed in Example 5.6 we can discuss the relationship between the Hofer distance and displacement. First we introduce some notations for this purpose. We denote by $Ham(X, \omega)$ the group of Hamiltonian diffeomorphisms of (X, ω). For a time-dependent Hamiltonian $H : [0,1] \times X \to \mathbb{R}$, we denote by ϕ_H^t the time t-map of Hamilton's equation $\dot{x} = X_H(t, x)$. The Hofer norm of $\psi \in Ham(X, \omega)$ is defined to be

$$\|\psi\| = \inf_{H; \phi_H^1 = \psi} \int_0^1 (\max H_t - \min H_t)\, dt.$$

(See [H].)

Definition 5.9. Let $Y \subset X$. We define the *displacement energy* $e(Y) \in [0,\infty]$ by

$$e(Y) := \inf\{\|\psi\| \mid \psi \in Ham(X,\omega),\ \psi(Y) \cap \overline{Y} = \emptyset\}.$$

We put $e(Y) = \infty$ if there exists no $\psi \in Ham(X,\omega)$ with $\psi(Y) \cap \overline{Y} = \emptyset$.

Let us consider $\mathfrak{PO}(y_1,\cdots,y_n;u_1,\cdots,u_n) : \Lambda_0^n \times P \to \Lambda_+$ as in Theorem 4.5.

Definition 5.10. We define the number $\mathfrak{E}(u) \in (0,\infty]$ as the supremum of all λ such that there exists $\mathfrak{y}_1,\cdots,\mathfrak{y}_n \in (\Lambda_0 \setminus \Lambda_0^+)^n$ satisfying

$$\frac{\partial \mathfrak{PO}}{\partial y_i}(\mathfrak{y}_1,\cdots,\mathfrak{y}_n;u) \equiv 0 \mod T^\lambda \tag{5.5}$$

for $i = 1,\cdots,n$. (Here we consider universal Novikov ring with $\mathbb{C}$-coefficients.) We call $\mathfrak{E}(u)$ the $\mathfrak{PO}$-*threshold* of the fiber $L(u)$. We put

$$\overline{\mathfrak{E}}(u) = \limsup_{\omega_i \to \omega, u_i \to u} \mathfrak{E}(u_i).$$

Here limsup is taken over all sequences ω_i and u_i such that ω_i is a sequence of T^n invariant symplectic structures on X with $\lim_{i\to\infty}\omega_i = \omega$ and u_i is a sequence of points of moment polytopes P_i of (X,ω_i) such that P_i converges to P and u_i converges to u.

Clearly $\overline{\mathfrak{E}}(u) \geq \mathfrak{E}(u)$. We will give an example where $\overline{\mathfrak{E}}(u) \neq \mathfrak{E}(u)$ in Example 10.17 (10.16).

Theorem 5.11. *For any compact toric manifold X and $L(u) = \pi^{-1}(u)$, $u \in \mathrm{Int}P$, we have*

$$e(L(u)) \geq 2\pi\overline{\mathfrak{E}}(u). \tag{5.6}$$

We will prove Theorem 5.11 in section 13.

Remark 5.12. The equality in (5.6) holds in various examples. However there are cases that the equality in (5.6) does not hold. The situation is the same as Remark 5.8.

We like to remark $\mathfrak{E}(u)$, $\overline{\mathfrak{E}}(u)$ can be calculated in most of the cases once the toric manifold X is given explicitly. In fact the leading order potential function $\mathfrak{PO}_0$ is explicitly calculated by Theorem 4.5. We can then find the maximal value λ for which the polynomial equations

$$\frac{\partial \mathfrak{PO}_0}{\partial y_i}(u;\mathfrak{y}_1,\cdots,\mathfrak{y}_n) \equiv 0 \mod T^\lambda$$

has a solution $\mathfrak{y}_i \in \Lambda_0 \setminus \Lambda_+$. In a weakly degenerate case this value of λ for $\mathfrak{PO}(u;\cdots)$ is the same as the value for $\mathfrak{PO}_0(u;\cdots)$. (See section 10.)

Remark 5.13. Appearance of a new family of pseudo-holomorphic discs with Maslov index 2 after blow up, which we observed in Examples 5.7 can be related to the operator $\mathfrak{q}$ that we introduced in section 3.8 [FOOO3] (= section 13 [FOOO2]) in the following way.

We denote by $\mathcal{M}^{\mathrm{main}}_{k+1,l}(\beta)$ the moduli space of stable maps $f : (\Sigma,\partial\Sigma) \to (X,L)$ from bordered Riemann surface Σ of genus zero with l interior and $k+1$ boundary marked points and in homology class β. (See section 3 [FOOO1] (= subsection 2.1.2 [FOOO3]). The symbol main means that we require the boundary marked points to respect the cyclic order of $\partial\Sigma$.) Let us consider the case when Maslov index of β

is $2n$. More precisely we take the following class β. We use notation introduced at the beginning of section 11. We put $\beta = \beta_{i_1} + \cdots + \beta_{i_n}$, where $\partial_{i_1} P \cap \cdots \cap \partial_{i_n} P = \overline{p}$ is an vertex of P. We assume $[f] \in \mathcal{M}^{\rm main}_{0+1,1}(\beta)$ and $\mathcal{M}^{\rm main}_{0+1,1}(\beta)$ is Fredholm regular at f. The virtual dimension of $\mathcal{M}^{\rm main}_{0+1,1}(\beta)$ is $3n$. Let us take the unique point $p \in X$ such that $\pi(p) = \overline{p}$. p is the T^n fixed point. We assume moreover $f(0) = p$. We blow up X at a point $p = f(0) \in X$ and obtain $\widehat{X}$. Let $[E] \in H_{2n-2}(\widehat{X})$ be the homology class of the exceptional divisor $E = \pi^{-1}(p)$. Now f induces a map $\widehat{f} : (\Sigma; \partial\Sigma) \to (\widehat{X}, L)$. The Maslov index of the homology class $[\widehat{f}] \in H_2(\widehat{X}, L)$ becomes 2. We put $\widehat{\beta} = [\widehat{f}]$.

Since p is a fixed point of T^n action, a T^n-invariant perturbation lifts to a perturbation of the moduli space $\mathcal{M}^{\rm main}_{0+1,0}(\widehat{\beta})$. Then any T^n-orbit of the moduli space $\mathcal{M}^{\rm main}_{0+1,0}(X;\beta)$ of holomorphic discs passing through p corresponds to the T^n-orbit of $\mathcal{M}^{\rm main}_{0+1,0}(\widehat{X};\widehat{\beta})$ and vice versa. Namely we have an isomorphism

$$\mathcal{M}^{\rm main}_{0+1,1}(\beta) \ {}_{ev}\times_X \{p\} \cong \mathcal{M}^{\rm main}_{0+1,0}(\widehat{\beta}). \tag{5.7}$$

Here ev in the left hand side is the evaluation map at the interior marked point. (Actually we need to work out analytic detail of gluing construction etc.. It seems very likely that we can do it in the same way as the argument of Chapter 10 [FOOO2]. See also [LiRu].)

Using (5.7) we may prove :

$$\mathfrak{q}_{1,k;\beta}(PD([p]); b, \cdots, b) = \mathfrak{m}_{k,\widehat{\beta}}(b, \cdots, b),$$

where

$$\mathfrak{q}_{1,k;\beta}(Q; P_1, \cdots, P_k) = ev_{0*}\left(\mathcal{M}^{\rm main}_{k+1,1}(\beta) \times_{(X\times L^k)} (Q \times P_1 \times \cdots \times P_k)\right)$$

is defined in section 3.8 [FOOO3] (=section 13 [FOOO2]). (Here Q is a chain in X and P_i are chains in $L(u)$, and $ev_0 : \mathcal{M}^{\rm main}_{k+1,1}(\beta) \to X$ is the evaluation map at the 0-th boundary marked point. In the right hand side, we take fiber product over $X \times L^k$.) This is an example of a blow-up formula in Lagrangian Floer theory.

6. Quantum cohomology and Jacobian ring

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.9. Let $\mathfrak{PO}_0$ be the leading order potential function. (Recall if X is Fano, we have $\mathfrak{PO}_0 = \mathfrak{PO}$.) We define the monomial

$$\overline{z}_i(u) = y_1^{v_{i,1}} \cdots y_n^{v_{i,n}} T^{\ell_i(u)} \in \Lambda_0[y_1, \cdots, y_n, y_1^{-1}, \cdots, y_n^{-1}]. \tag{6.1}$$

Compare this with (2.3). It is also suggestive to write $\overline{z}_i$ also as

$$\overline{z}_i(u) = e^{\langle x, v_i\rangle} T^{\ell_i(u)},\ x = (x_1, \cdots, x_n),\ y_i = e^{x_i}. \tag{6.2}$$

By definition we have

$$\mathfrak{PO}_0^u = \sum_{i=1}^m \overline{z}_i(u) \tag{6.3}$$

$$y_j \frac{\partial \overline{z}_i}{\partial y_j} = v_{i,j} \overline{z}_i(u). \tag{6.4}$$

The following is a restatement of Theorem 1.9. Let $z_i \in H^2(X;\mathbb{Z})$ be the Poincaré dual of the divisor $\pi^{-1}(\partial_i P)$.

Theorem 6.1. *If X is Fano, there exists an isomorphism*

$$\psi_u : QH(X;\Lambda) \cong Jac(\mathfrak{PO})$$

such that $\psi_u(z_i) = \overline{z}_i(u)$.

Since $c_1(X) = \sum_{i=1}^m z_i$ (see [Ful]) and $\mathfrak{PO}_0^u = \sum_{i=1}^m \overline{z}_i(u)$ by definition, Theorem 1.9 follows from Theorem 6.1.

In the rest of this section, we prove Theorem 6.1. We remark that z_i ($i = 1, \cdots, m$) generates the quantum cohomology ring $QH(X;\Lambda)$ as a Λ-algebra (see Theorem 6.6 below). Therefore it is enough to prove that the assignment $\tilde{\psi}_u(z_i) = \overline{z}_i(u)$ extends to a homomorphism $\tilde{\psi}_u : \Lambda[z_1, \cdots, z_m] \to Jac(\mathfrak{PO}_0^u)$ that induces an isomorphism in $QH(X;\Lambda)$. In other words, it suffices to show that the relations among the generators in $\Lambda[z_1, \cdots, z_m]$ and in $Jac(\mathfrak{PO}_0^u)$ are mapped to each other under the assignment $\tilde{\psi}_u(z_i) = \overline{z}_i(u)$. To establish this correspondence, we now review Batyrev's description of the relations among z_i's.

We first clarify the definition of quantum cohomology ring over the universal Novikov rings Λ_0 and Λ. Let (X,ω) be a symplectic manifold and $\alpha \in \pi_2(X)$. Let $\mathcal{M}_3(\alpha)$ be the moduli space of stable map with homology class α of genus 0 with 3 marked points. Let $ev : \mathcal{M}_3(\alpha) \to X^3$ be the evaluation map. We can define the virtual fundamental class $ev_*[\mathcal{M}_3(\alpha)] \in H_d(X^3;\mathbb{Q})$ where $d = 2(\dim_{\mathbb{C}} X + c_1(X) \cap \alpha)$. Let $a_i \in H^*(X;\mathbb{Q})$. We define $a_1 \cup_Q a_2 \in H^*(X;\Lambda_0)$ by the following formula.

$$\langle a_1 \cup_Q a_2, a_3\rangle = \sum_{\alpha} T^{\omega\cap\alpha/2\pi} ev_*[\mathcal{M}_3(\alpha)] \cap (a_1 \times a_2 \times a_3). \tag{6.5}$$

Here $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ is the Poincaré duality. Extending this linearly we obtain the quantum product

$$\cup_Q : H(X;\Lambda_0) \otimes H(X;\Lambda_0) \to H(X;\Lambda_0).$$

Extending the coefficient ring further to Λ, we obtain the (small) quantum cohomology ring $QH(X;\Lambda)$.

Now we specialize to the case of compact toric manifolds and review Batyrev's presentation of quantum cohomology ring. We consider the exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \pi_2(X) \longrightarrow \pi_2(X;L(u)) \longrightarrow \pi_1(L(u)) \longrightarrow 0. \tag{6.6}$$

We note $\pi_2(X;L(u)) \cong \mathbb{Z}^m$ and choose its basis adapted to this exact sequence as follows : Consider the divisor $\pi^{-1}(\partial_i P)$ and take a small disc transversal to it. Each such disc gives rise to an element

$$[\beta_i] \in H_2(X;\pi^{-1}(\mathrm{Int}P)) \cong H_2(X;L(u)) \cong \pi_2(X,L(u)). \tag{6.7}$$

The set of $[\beta_i]$ with $i = 1, \cdots, m$ forms a basis of $\pi_2(X;L(u)) \cong \mathbb{Z}^m$. The boundary map $[\beta] \mapsto [\partial\beta] : \pi_2(X;L(u)) \to \pi_1(L(u))$ is identified with the corresponding map $H_2(X;L(u)) \to H_1(L(u))$. Using the basis chosen in Lemma 4.4 on $H_1(L(u))$ we identify $H_1(L(u)) \cong \mathbb{Z}^n$. Then this homomorphism maps $[\beta_i]$ to

$$[\partial\beta_i] \cong v_i = (v_{i,1}, \cdots, v_{i,n}), \tag{6.8}$$

where $v_{i,j}$ is as in (4.4). By the exactness of (6.6), we have an isomorphism

$$H_2(X) \cong \{\beta \in H_2(X;L(u)) \mid [\partial\beta] = 0\}. \tag{6.9}$$

Lemma 6.2. *We have*

$$\omega \cap \Big[\sum k_i\beta_i\Big] = 2\pi \sum k_i \ell_i(u). \tag{6.10}$$

If $[\sum k_i \partial\beta_i] = 0$ *then*

$$\sum k_i \frac{d\ell_i}{du_j} = 0. \tag{6.11}$$

In particular, the right hand side of (6.10) is independent of u.

Proof. (6.10) follows from the area formula (2.12), $\omega(\beta_i) = 2\pi\ell_i(u)$. On the other hand if $[\sum k_i \partial\beta_i] = 0$, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m} k_i v_i = 0.$$

By the definition of ℓ_i, $\ell_i(u) = \langle u, v_i\rangle - \lambda_i$, from Theorem 2.13, this equation is precisely (6.11) and hence the proof. □

Let $\mathcal{P} \subset \{1, \cdots, m\}$ be a primitive collection (see Definition 2.4). There exists a unique subset $\mathcal{P}' \subset \{1, \cdots, m\}$ such that $\sum_{i\in\mathcal{P}} v_i$ lies in the interior of the cone spanned by $\{v_{i'} \mid i' \in \mathcal{P}'\}$, which is a member of the fan Σ. (Since X is compact, we can choose such $\mathcal{P}'$. See section 2.4 [Ful].) We write

$$\sum_{i\in\mathcal{P}} v_i = \sum_{i'\in\mathcal{P}'} k_{i'} v_{i'}. \tag{6.12}$$

Since X is assumed to be nonsingular $k_{i'}$ are all positive integers. (See p.29 of [Ful].) We put

$$\omega(\mathcal{P}) = \sum_{i\in\mathcal{P}} \ell_i(u) - \sum_{i'\in\mathcal{P}'} k_{i'}\ell_{i'}(u). \tag{6.13}$$

It follows from (6.10) that $2\pi\omega(\mathcal{P})$ is the symplectic area of the homotopy class

$$\beta(\mathcal{P}) = \sum_{i\in\mathcal{P}} \beta_i - \sum_{i'\in\mathcal{P}'} k_{i'}\beta_{i'} \in \pi_2(X). \tag{6.14}$$

Lemma 6.3. *Let* $\mathcal{P}$ *be any primitive collection. Then* $\omega(\mathcal{P}) > 0$.

Proof. Since the cone spanned by $\{v_{i'} | i' \in \mathcal{P}'\}$ belongs to the fan Σ, we have

$$\bigcap_{i'\in\mathcal{P}'} \pi^{-1}(\partial_{i'}P) \neq \emptyset.$$

Then for any $u' \in \bigcap_{i'\in\mathcal{P}'} \partial_{i'}P$, we have $\ell_{i'}(u') = 0$. By the choice of $k_{i'}$ in (6.12), we have $\partial\beta(\mathcal{P}) = 0$. Therefore by Lemma 6.2 and by the continuity of the right hand side of (6.13) we can evaluate $\omega(\mathcal{P})$ at a point $u' \in \bigcap_{i'\in\mathcal{P}'} \pi^{-1}(\partial_{i'}P)$. Then we obtain

$$\omega(\mathcal{P}) = \sum_{i\in\mathcal{P}} \ell_i(u').$$

Since $\mathcal{P}$ is a primitive collection, and in particular does not form a member of the fan, there must be an element $v_i \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $\ell_i(u') > 0$ and so $\omega(\mathcal{P}) > 0$. This finishes the proof. □

Now we associate formal variables, $z_1, \cdots, z_m$, to $v_1, \cdots, v_m$, respectively.

Definition 6.4 (Batyrev [B1])**.** (1) The *quantum Stanley-Reisner ideal* $SR_\omega(X)$ is the ideal generated by

$$z(\mathcal{P}) = \prod_{i\in\mathcal{P}} z_i - T^{\omega(\mathcal{P})} \prod_{i'\in\mathcal{P}'} z_{i'}^{k_{i'}} \tag{6.15}$$

in the polynomial ring $\Lambda[z_1, \cdots, z_m]$. Here $\mathcal{P}$ runs over all primitive collections.

(2) We denote by $P(X)$ the ideal generated by

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m} v_{i,j} z_i \tag{6.16}$$

for $j = 1, \cdots, n$. In this paper we call $P(X)$ the *linear relation ideal*.

(3) We call the quotient

$$QH^{\omega}(X;\Lambda) = \frac{\Lambda[z_1, \cdots, z_m]}{(P(X) + SR_{\omega}(X))} \tag{6.17}$$

the *Batyrev quantum cohomology ring*.

Remark 6.5. We do not take closure of our ideal $P(X) + SR_{\omega}(X)$ here. See Proposition 8.6.

Theorem 6.6 (Batyrev [B1], Givental [Gi2])**.** *If X is Fano there exists a ring isomorphism from $QH^{\omega}(X;\Lambda)$ to the quantum cohomology ring $QH(X;\Lambda)$ of X such that z_i is sent to the Poincaré dual to $\pi^{-1}(\partial_i P)$.*

The main geometric part of the proof of Theorem 6.6 is the following.

Proposition 6.7. *The Poincaré dual to $\pi^{-1}(\partial_i P)$ satisfy the quantum Stanley-Reisner relation.*

We do not prove Proposition 6.7 in this paper. See Remarks 6.15 and 6.16. However since our choice of the coefficient ring is different from other literature, we explain here for reader's convenience how Theorem 6.6 follows from Proposition 6.7.

Proposition 6.7 implies that we can define a ring homomorphism $h : QH^{\omega}(X;\Lambda) \to QH(X;\Lambda)$ by sending z_i to $PD(\pi^{-1}(\partial_i P))$. Let $F^k QH(X;\Lambda)$ be the direct sum of elements of degree $\leq k$. Let $F^k QH^{\omega}(X;\Lambda)$ be the submodule generated by the polynomial of degree at most $k/2$ on z_i. Clearly $h(F^k QH^{\omega}(X;\Lambda)) \subset F^k QH(X;\Lambda)$.

Since X is Fano, it follows that,

$$x \cup_Q y - x \cup y \in F^{\deg x + \deg y - 2} QH(X;\Lambda).$$

We also recall the cohomology ring $H(X;\mathbb{Q})$ is obtained by putting $T = 0$ in quantum Stanley-Reisner relation. Moreover we find that the second product of the right hand side of (6.15) has degree strictly smaller than the first since X is Fano.

Therefore the graded ring

$$gr(QH(X;\Lambda)) = \bigoplus_k F^k(QH(X;\Lambda))/F^{k-1}(QH(X;\Lambda)),$$

is isomorphic to the (usual) cohomology ring (with Λ coefficient) as a ring. The same holds for $QH^{\omega}(X;\Lambda)$. It follows that h is an isomorphism. □

In the rest of this section, we will prove the following Proposition 6.8. Theorem 6.1 follows immediately from Proposition 6.8 and Theorem 6.6.

Proposition 6.8. *There exists an isomorphism :*

$$\psi_u : QH^{\omega}(X;\Lambda) \cong Jac(\mathfrak{P}\mathfrak{O}_0^u)$$

such that $\psi_u(z_i) = \overline{z}_i(u)$.

We remark that we do *not* assume that X is Fano in Proposition 6.8. We also remark that for our main purpose to calculate $\mathfrak{M}_0(\mathfrak{Lag}(X))$, Proposition 6.8 suffices. Proposition 6.8 is a rather simple algebraic result whose proof does not require study of pseudo-holomorphic discs or spheres.

Proof of Proposition 6.8. We start with the following proposition.

Proposition 6.9. *The assignment*

$$\widehat{\psi}_u(z_i) = \overline{z}_i(u) \tag{6.18}$$

induces a well-defined ring isomorphism

$$\widehat{\psi}_u : \frac{\Lambda\left[z_1, \cdots, z_m\right]}{SR_\omega(X)} \to \Lambda[y_1, \cdots, y_n, y_1^{-1}, \cdots, y_n^{-1}]. \tag{6.19}$$

Proof. Let $\mathcal{P}$ be a primitive collection and $\mathcal{P}'$, $k_{i'}$ be as in (6.12). We calculate

$$\prod_{i\in\mathcal{P}} \overline{z}_i(u) = \prod_{i\in\mathcal{P}} y_1^{v_{i,1}} \cdots y_n^{v_{i,n}} T^{\ell_i(u)} \tag{6.20}$$

by (6.1). On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}\prod_{i'\in\mathcal{P}'} \overline{z}_{i'}^{k_{i'}}(u) &= \prod_{i'\in\mathcal{P}'} y_1^{k_{i'}v_{i',1}} \cdots y_n^{k_{i'}v_{i',n}} T^{k_{i'}\ell_{i'}(u)} \\ &= \prod_{i\in\mathcal{P}} y_1^{v_{i,1}} \cdots y_n^{v_{i,n}} \prod_{i'\in\mathcal{P}'} T^{k_{i'}\ell_{i'}(u)}\end{aligned}$$

by (6.12). Moreover

$$\sum_{i\in\mathcal{P}} \ell_i(u) - \sum_{i\in\mathcal{P}'} k_{i'}\ell_{i'}(u) = \omega(\mathcal{P})$$

by (6.13). Therefore

$$\prod_{i\in\mathcal{P}} \overline{z}_i(u) = T^{\omega(\mathcal{P})} \prod_{i'\in\mathcal{P}'} \overline{z}_{i'}^{k_{i'}}(u)$$

in $\Lambda[y_1, \cdots, y_n, y_1^{-1}, \cdots, y_n^{-1}]$. In other words, (6.18) defines a well-defined ring homomorphism (6.19).

We now prove that $\widehat{\psi}_u$ is an isomorphism. Let

$$pr : \mathbb{Z}^m \cong \pi_2(X; L(u)) \longrightarrow \mathbb{Z}^n \cong \pi_1(L(u))$$

be the homomorphism induced by the boundary map $pr([\beta]) = [\partial\beta]$. (See (2.1).) We remark $pr(c_1, \ldots, c_m) = (d_1, \ldots, d_n)$ with $d_j = \sum_i c_i v_{i,j}$. Let $A = \sum_i c_i\beta_i$ be an element in the kernel of pr. We write it as

$$\sum_{i\in I} a_i\beta_i - \sum_{j\in J} b_j\beta_j$$

where a_i b_j are positive and $I \cap J = \emptyset$. We define

$$r(A) = \prod_{i\in I} z_i^{a_i} - T^{\sum_i a_i\ell_i(u) - \sum_j b_j\ell_j(u)} \prod_{j\in J} z_j^{b_j}. \tag{6.21}$$

We remark that a generator of quantum Stanley-Reisner ideal corresponds to $r(A)$ for which I is a primitive collection $\mathcal{P}$ and $J = \mathcal{P}'$. We also remark that the case $I = \emptyset$ or $J = \emptyset$ is included.

Lemma 6.10.

$$r(A) \in SR_\omega(X).$$

Proof. This lemma is proved in [B1]. We include its proof (which is different from one in [B1]) here for reader's convenience. We prove the lemma by an induction over the values

$$E(A) = \sum_{i \in I} a_i \ell_i(u_0) + \sum_{j \in J} b_j \ell_j(u_0).$$

Here we fix a point $u_0 \in \mathrm{Int} P$ during the proof of Lemma 6.10.

Since $I \cap J = \emptyset$, at least one of $\{v_i \mid i \in I\}$, $\{v_j \mid j \in J\}$ can not span a cone that is a member of the fan Σ. Without loss of generality, we assume that $\{v_i \mid i \in I\}$ does not span such a cone. Then it contains a subset $\mathcal{P} \subset I$ that is a primitive collection. We take $\mathcal{P}'$, $k_{i'}$ as in (6.12) and define

$$Z = \prod_{i \in I} z_i^{a_i} - T^{\omega(\mathcal{P})} \prod_{i \in I \setminus \mathcal{P}} z_i^{a_i} \prod_{i \in \mathcal{P}} z_i^{a_i - 1} \prod_{i'' \in \mathcal{P}'} z_{i''}^{k_{i''}}. \tag{6.22}$$

Then Z lies in $SR_\omega(X)$ by construction. We recall from Lemma 6.2 that the values

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{P}} \ell_i(u) - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{P}'} k_i \ell_i(u) = \omega(\mathcal{P})$$

are independent of u and positive. By the definitions (6.21), (6.22) of $r(A)$ and Z, we can express

$$r(A) - Z = T^{\omega(\mathcal{P})+c} \left(\prod_{h \in K} z_h^{n_h} \right) r(B)$$

for an appropriate B in the kernel of pr and a constant c. Moreover we have

$$E(B) + 2 \sum_{h \in K} n_h \ell_h(u_0) + \omega(\mathcal{P}) = E(A).$$

Since $u_0 \in \mathrm{Int}\, P$ it follows that $\ell_h(u_0) > 0$ which in turn gives rise to $E(B) < E(A)$. The induction hypothesis then implies $r(B) \in SR_\omega(X)$. The proof of the lemma is now complete. □

Corollary 6.11. *z_i is invertible in*

$$\frac{\Lambda\,[z_1, \cdots, z_m]}{SR_\omega(X)}.$$

Proof. Since X is compact, the vector $-v_i$ is in some cone spanned by v_j $(j \in I)$. Namely

$$-v_i = \sum_{j \in I} k_j v_j$$

where k_j are nonnegative integers. Then

$$T^{\ell_i(u) + \sum_j k_j \ell_j(u)} = z_i \prod_{j \in I} z_j^{k_j} \mod SR_\omega(X)$$

by Lemma 6.10. Since $T^{\ell_i(u)+\sum_j k_j \ell_j(u)}$ is invertible in the field Λ, it follows that $\prod_{j \in I} z_j^{k_j}$ defines the inverse of z_i in the quotient ring. □

We recall from Lemma 6.2 that $\ell_i(u) + \sum_j k_j \ell_j(u)$ is independent of u. We *define*

$$z_i^{-1} = T^{-\ell_i(u) - \sum_j k_j \ell_j(u)} \prod_{j \in I} z_j^{k_j}. \tag{6.23}$$

(Note we have not yet proved that $\Lambda\,[z_1, \cdots, z_m]/SR_\omega(X)$ is an integral domain. This will follow later when we prove Proposition 6.9.)

Since $v_1, \cdots, v_m$ generates the lattice $\mathbb{Z}^n$, we can always assume the following by changing the order of v_i, if necessary.

Condition 6.12. The determinant of the $n \times n$ matrix $(v_{i,j})_{i,j=1,\cdots,n}$ is ± 1.

Let $(v^{i,j})$ be the inverse matrix of $(v_{i,j})$. Namely $\sum_j v^{i,j} v_{j,k} = \delta_{i,k}$. Condition 6.12 implies that each $v^{i,j}$ is an integer. Inverting the matrix $(v_{i,j})$, we obtain

$$y_i = T^{-c_i(u)} \prod_{j=1}^{n} \overline{z}_i^{v^{i,j}} \tag{6.24}$$

from (6.20) where $c_i(u) = \sum v^{i,j} \ell_j(u)$. We define using Corollary 6.11

$$\widehat{\phi}_u(y_i^{\pm 1}) = T^{-\pm c_i(u)} \prod_{j=1}^{n} z_j^{\pm v^{i,j}} \in \frac{\Lambda\left[z_1, \cdots, z_m\right]}{SR_\omega(X)}.$$

More precisely, we plug (6.23) here if $\pm v^{i,j}$ is negative.

The identity $\widehat{\psi}_u \circ \widehat{\phi}_u = id$ is a consequence of (6.24). We next calculate $(\widehat{\phi}_u \circ \widehat{\psi}_u)(z_h) = \widehat{\phi}_u(\overline{z}_h(u))$ and prove

$$(\widehat{\phi}_u \circ \widehat{\psi}_u)(z_h) = T^{\ell_h(u)} \widehat{\phi}_u(y_1^{v_{h,1}} \cdots y_n^{v_{h,n}}) = T^{e(h;u)} \prod_{j=1}^{n} z_j^{m_j},$$

where $m_j \geq 0$ and

$$v_h = \sum m_j v_j, \qquad \ell_h(u) = e(h;u) + \sum m_j \ell_j(u) : \tag{6.25}$$

To see (6.25), we consider any *monomial* Z of $y_i, z_i, \overline{z}_i, T^\alpha$. We define its multiplicative valuation $\mathfrak{v}_u(Z) \in \mathbb{R}$ by putting

$$\mathfrak{v}_u(y_i) = 0, \quad \mathfrak{v}_u(z_i) = \mathfrak{v}_u(\overline{z}_i) = \ell_i(u), \quad \mathfrak{v}_u(T^\alpha) = \alpha.$$

We also define a (multiplicative) grading $\rho(Z) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ by

$$\rho(y_i) = \mathbf{e}_i, \quad \rho(z_i) = \rho(\overline{z}_i) = v_i, \quad \rho(T^\alpha) = 0.$$

and by $\rho(ZZ') = \rho(Z) + \rho(Z')$. We remark that $\mathfrak{v}_u$ and ρ are consistent with (6.1). We next observe that both $\mathfrak{v}_u$ and ρ are preserved by $\widehat{\psi}_u$, $\widehat{\phi}_u$ and by (6.23). This implies (6.25).

Now we use Lemma 6.10 and (6.25) to conclude

$$z_h - T^{e(h;u)} \prod_{j=1}^{n} z_j^{m_j} \in SR_\omega(X).$$

The proof of Proposition 6.9 is now complete. □

Next we prove

Lemma 6.13. *Let $P(X)$ be the linear relation ideal defined in Definition 6.4. Then*

$$\widehat{\psi}_u(P(X)) = \left(\frac{\partial \mathfrak{PO}_0^u}{\partial y_i}; i = 1, \cdots, n \right).$$

Proof. Let $\sum_{i=1}^m v_{i,j} z_i$ be in $P(X)$. Then we have

$$\widehat{\psi}_u \left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} v_{i,j} z_i \right) = \sum_{i=1}^{m} v_{i,j} \overline{z}_i = \sum_{i=1}^{m} y_j \frac{\partial \overline{z}_i}{\partial y_j} = y_j \frac{\partial \mathfrak{PO}_0^u}{\partial y_j}$$

by (6.1) and (6.4). Since y_j's are invertible in $\Lambda[y_1, \cdots, y_n, y_1^{-1}, \cdots, y_n^{-1}]$, this identity implies the lemma. □

The proof of Theorem 6.1 and of Proposition 6.8 is now complete. □

Remark 6.14. Proposition 6.8 holds over Λ^R coefficient for arbitrary commutative ring R with unit. The proof is the same.

We define

$$\psi_{u',u} : Jac(\mathfrak{PO}_0^u) \to Jac(\mathfrak{PO}_0^{u'})$$

by

$$\psi_{u',u}(\overline{z}_i(u)) = \overline{z}_i(u') = T^{\ell_i(u')-\ell_i(u)}\overline{z}_i(u). \tag{6.26}$$

It is an isomorphism. We have

$$\psi_{u',u} \circ \psi_u = \psi_{u'}.$$

The well-definedness $\psi_{u',u}$ is proved from this formula or by checking directly.

In case no confusion can occur, we identify $Jac(\mathfrak{PO}_0^u)$, $Jac(\mathfrak{PO}_0^{u'})$ by $\psi_{u',u}$ and denote them by $Jac(\mathfrak{PO}_0)$. Since $\psi_{u',u}(\overline{z}_i(u)) = \overline{z}_i(u')$ we write them $\overline{z}_i$ when we regard it as an element of $Jac(\mathfrak{PO}_0)$. Note $\psi_{u',u}(y_i) \neq y_i$. In case we regard $y_i \in Jac(\mathfrak{PO}_0^u)$ as an element of $Jac(\mathfrak{PO}_0)$ we write it as $y_i(u) := \psi_u(y_i)$.

Remark 6.15. The above proof of Theorem 6.1 uses Batyrev's presentation of quantum cohomology ring and is not likely generalized beyond the case of compact toric manifolds. (In fact the proof is purely algebraic and do *not* contain serious study of pseudo-holomorphic curve, except Proposition 6.7, which we quote without proof and Theorem 4.5, which is a minor improvement of an earlier result of [CO].) There is an alternative way of constructing the ring homomorphism ψ_u which is less computational. (This will give a new proof of Proposition 6.7.) We will give this conceptual proof in a sequel to this paper.

We use the operations

$$\mathfrak{q}_{1,k;\beta} : H(X;\mathbb{Q})[2] \otimes B_k H(L(u);\mathbb{Q})[1] \to H(L(u);\mathbb{Q})[1]$$

which was introduced by the authors in section 3.8 [FOOO3] (= section 13 [FOOO2]). Using the class $z_i \in H^2(X;\mathbb{Z})$ the Poincaré dual to $\pi^{-1}(\partial_i P)$ we put

$$\psi_u(z_i) = \sum_k \sum_{i=1}^m T^{\beta_i \cap \omega/2\pi} \int_{L(u)} \mathfrak{q}_{1,k;\beta_i}(z_i \otimes x^{\otimes k}). \tag{6.27}$$

Here we put $x = \sum x_i \mathbf{e}_i$ and the right hand side is a formal power series of x_i with coefficients in Λ.

Using the description of the moduli space defining the operators $\mathfrak{q}_{1,k;\beta}$ (See section 11.) it is easy to see that the right hand side of (6.27) coincides with the definition of $\overline{z}_i$ in the current case, when X is Fano toric. Extending the expression (6.27) to an arbitrary homology class z of arbitrary degree we obtain

$$\psi_u(z) = \sum_k \sum_{\beta;\mu(\beta)=\deg z} T^{\beta\cap\omega/2\pi} \int_{L(u)} \mathfrak{q}_{1,k;\beta}(z \otimes x^{\otimes k}). \tag{6.28}$$

Since $\mu(\beta) = \deg z$, $\mathfrak{q}_{1,k;\beta}(z \otimes x^{\otimes k}) \in H^n(L(u);\mathbb{Q})$. One can prove that (6.28) defines a ring homomorphism from quantum cohomology to the Jacobian ring $Jac(\mathfrak{PO}^u)$. We may regard $Jac(\mathfrak{PO}^u)$ as the moduli space of deformations of Floer theories of Lagrangian fibers of X. (Note the Jacobian ring parameterizes deformations of a

holomorphic function up to an appropriate equivalence. In our case the equivalence is the right equivalence, that is, the coordinate change of the *domain*.)

Thus (6.28) is a particular case of the ring homomorphism

$$QH(X) \to HH(\mathfrak{Lag}(X))$$

where $HH(\mathfrak{Lag}(X))$ is the Hochschild cohomology of Fukaya category of X. (We remark that Hochschild cohomology parameterizes deformations of A_∞ category.) Existence of such a homomorphism is a folk theorem (See [Ko]) which is verified by various people in various favorable situations. (See for example [Aur].) It is conjectured to be an isomorphism under certain conditions by various people including P. Seidel and M. Kontsevich.

This point of view is suitable for generalizing our story to more general X (to non-Fano toric manifolds, for example) and also for including big quantum cohomology group into our story. (We will then also need to use the operators $\mathfrak{q}_{\ell,k}$ mentioned above for $\ell \geq 2$.)

These points will be discussed in subsequent papers in this series of papers. In this paper we follow more elementary approach exploiting the known calculation of quantum cohomology of toric manifolds, although it is less conceptual.

Remark 6.16. There are two other approaches towards a proof of Proposition 6.7 besides the fixed point localization. One is written by Cieliebak and Salamon [CS] which uses vortex equations (gauged sigma model) and the other is written by McDuff and Tolman [MT] which uses Seidel's result [Se1].

7. Localization of quantum cohomology ring at moment polytope

In this section, we discuss applications of Theorem 1.9. In particular, we prove Theorem 1.12. (Note Theorem 1.3 is a consequence of Theorem 1.12.) The next theorem and Theorem 1.9 immediately imply (1) of Theorem 1.12.

Theorem 7.1. *There exists a bijection*

$$\mathrm{Crit}(\mathfrak{PO}_0) \cong Hom(Jac(\mathfrak{PO}_0); \Lambda^{\mathbb{C}}).$$

Here the right hand side is the set of unital $\Lambda^{\mathbb{C}}$-algebra homomorphisms.

We start with the following definition

Definition 7.2. For an element $x \in \Lambda \setminus \{0\}$, we define its valuation $\mathfrak{v}_T(x)$ as the unique number $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $T^{-\lambda}x \in \Lambda_0 \setminus \Lambda_+$.

We note that $\mathfrak{v}_T$ is multiplicative non-Archimedean valuation, i.e., satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{v}_T(x+y) &\geq \min(\mathfrak{v}_T(x), \mathfrak{v}_T(y)), \\ \mathfrak{v}_T(xy) &= \mathfrak{v}_T(x) + \mathfrak{v}_T(y). \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 7.3. *For any $\varphi \in Hom(Jac(\mathfrak{PO}_0); \Lambda^{\mathbb{C}})$ there exists a unique $u \in M_{\mathbb{R}}$ such that*

$$\mathfrak{v}_T(\varphi(y_j(u))) = 0 \tag{7.1}$$

for all $j = 1, \cdots, n$.

Proof. We still assume Condition 6.12. By definition (6.1) of $\overline{z}_i$, homomorphism property of φ and multiplicative property of valuation, we obtain

$$\mathfrak{v}_T(\varphi(\overline{z}_i)) = \ell_i(u) + \sum_{j=1}^{n} v_{i,j}\mathfrak{v}_T(\varphi(y_j(u))), \tag{7.2}$$

for $i = 1, \cdots, m$. On the other hand, since $\ell_i(u) = \langle u, v_i \rangle - \lambda_i$ and $(v_{i,j})_{i,j=1,\cdots,n}$ is invertible, there is a unique u that satisfies

$$\mathfrak{v}_T(\varphi(\overline{z}_i)) = \ell_i(u) \tag{7.3}$$

for $i = 1, \cdots, n$. But by the invertibility of $(v_{i,j})_{i,j=1,\cdots,n}$ and (7.2), this is equivalent to (7.1) and hence the proof. □

We remark that obviously by the above proof the formula (7.3) automatically holds for $i = n+1, \cdots, m$ and u in Lemma 7.3 as well.

Proof of Theorem 7.1. Consider the maps

$$\Psi_1(\varphi) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} (\log \varphi(y_i(u)))\mathbf{e}_i \in H^1(L(u); \Lambda_0), \qquad \Psi_2(\varphi) = u \in M_{\mathbb{R}}$$

where u is obtained as in Lemma 7.3. Since $y_i(u) \in \Lambda_0 \setminus \Lambda_+$ it follows that we can define its logarithm on Λ_0 as a convergent power series with respect to the non-Archimedean norm.

Set $(\mathfrak{x}, u) = (\Psi_1(\varphi), \Psi_2(\varphi))$. Since φ is a ring homomorphism from $Jac(\mathfrak{PO}_0) \cong Jac(\mathfrak{PO}_0^u)$ it follows from the definition of the Jacobian ring that

$$\frac{\partial \mathfrak{PO}_0^u}{\partial y_i}(\mathfrak{x}) = 0.$$

Therefore by Theorem 4.10, $HF((L(u), \mathfrak{x}), (L(u), \mathfrak{x}); \Lambda) \neq 0$. We have thus defined

$$\Psi : Hom(Jac(\mathfrak{PO}_0); \Lambda^{\mathbb{C}}) \to \mathrm{Crit}(\mathfrak{PO}_0).$$

Let $(\mathfrak{x}, u) \in \mathrm{Crit}(\mathfrak{PO}_0)$. We put $\mathfrak{x} = \sum \mathfrak{x}_i \mathbf{e}_i$. We define a homomorphism $\varphi : Jac(\mathfrak{PO}_0) \to \Lambda$ by assigning

$$\varphi(y_i(u)) = e^{\mathfrak{x}_i}.$$

It is straightforward to check that φ is well-defined. Then we define $\Phi(\mathfrak{x}, u) := \varphi$. It easily follows from definition that Φ is an inverse to Ψ. The proof of Theorem 7.1 is complete. □

We next work with the (Batyrev) quantum cohomology side.

Definition 7.4. For each z_i, we define a Λ-linear map $\widehat{z}_i : QH^\omega(X; \Lambda^{\mathbb{C}}) \to QH^\omega(X; \Lambda^{\mathbb{C}})$ by $\widehat{z}_i(z) = z_i \cup_Q z$, where $\cup_Q$ is the product in $QH^\omega(X; \Lambda^{\mathbb{C}})$.

Since $QH^\omega(X; \Lambda)$ is generated by even degree elements it follows that it is commutative. Therefore we have

$$\widehat{z}_i \circ \widehat{z}_j = \widehat{z}_j \circ \widehat{z}_i. \tag{7.4}$$

Definition 7.5. For $\mathfrak{w} = (\mathfrak{w}_1, \cdots, \mathfrak{w}_n) \in (\Lambda^{\mathbb{C}})^n$ we put

$$QH^\omega(X; \mathfrak{w}) = \{x \in QH^\omega(X; \Lambda^{\mathbb{C}}) \mid (\widehat{z}_i - \mathfrak{w}_i)^N x = 0 \quad \text{for } i = 1, \cdots, n \text{ and large } N.\}$$

We say that $\mathfrak{w}$ is a *weight* of $QH^\omega(X)$ if $QH^\omega(X; \mathfrak{w})$ is nonzero. We denote by $W(X; \omega)$ the set of weights of $QH^\omega(X)$.

We remark that $\mathfrak{w}_i \neq 0$ since z_i is invertible. (Corollary 6.11.)

Remark 7.6. Since z_i, $i = 1, \cdots, n$ generates $QH^\omega(X; \Lambda)$ by Condition 6.12, we have the following. For each $\mathfrak{w} = (\mathfrak{w}_1, \cdots, \mathfrak{w}_n)$, there exists $\mathfrak{w}_{n+1}, \cdots, \mathfrak{w}_m$ depending only on $\mathfrak{w}$ such that $(\widehat{z}_i - \mathfrak{w}_i)^N x = 0$ also holds for $i = n+1, \cdots, m$, if N is sufficiently large and $x \in QH^\omega(X; \mathfrak{w})$.

Proposition 7.7. (1) *There exists a factorization of the ring*

$$QH^\omega(X;\Lambda^{\mathbb{C}}) \cong \prod_{\mathfrak{w}\in W(X;\omega)} QH^\omega(X;\mathfrak{w}).$$

(2) *There exists a bijection*

$$W(X;\omega) \cong Hom(QH^\omega(X;\Lambda);\Lambda^{\mathbb{C}}).$$

(3) $QH^\omega(X;\mathfrak{w})$ *is a local ring and* (1) *is the factorization to indecomposables.*

Proof. Existence of decomposition (1) as a $\Lambda^{\mathbb{C}}$-vector space is a standard linear algebra, using the fact that $\Lambda^{\mathbb{C}}$ is an algebraically closed field. (We will prove this fact in appendix as Lemma 14.1.) If $z \in QH^\omega(X;\mathfrak{w})$ and $z' \in QH^\omega(X;\mathfrak{w}')$ then

$$(z_i - \mathfrak{w}_i)^N \cup_Q (z \cup_Q z') = ((z_i - \mathfrak{w}_i)^N \cup_Q z) \cup_Q z' = 0,$$
$$(z_i - \mathfrak{w}'_i)^N \cup_Q (z \cup_Q z') = ((z_i - \mathfrak{w}'_i)^N \cup_Q z') \cup_Q z = 0.$$

Therefore $z\cup_Q z' \in QH^\omega(X;\mathfrak{w})\cap QH^\omega(X;\mathfrak{w}')$. This implies that the decomposition (1) is a ring factorization.

Let $\varphi : QH^\omega(X;\mathfrak{w}) \to \Lambda^{\mathbb{C}}$ be a unital $\Lambda^{\mathbb{C}}$ algebra homomorphism. It induces a homomorphism $QH^\omega(X;\Lambda) \to \Lambda^{\mathbb{C}}$ by (1). We denote this ring homomorphism by the same letter φ. Let $z \in QH^\omega(X;\mathfrak{w})$ be an element such that $\varphi(z) \neq 0$. Then we have

$$(\varphi(z_i) - \mathfrak{w}_i)^N \varphi(z) = \varphi((z_i - \mathfrak{w}_i)^N \cup_Q z) = 0.$$

Therefore

$$\mathfrak{w}_i = \varphi(z_i). \tag{7.5}$$

Since z_i generates $QH^\omega(X;\Lambda)$, it follows from (7.5) that there is a unique $\Lambda^{\mathbb{C}}$ algebra homomorphism : $QH^\omega(X;\mathfrak{w}) \to \Lambda^{\mathbb{C}}$. (2) follows.

Since $QH^\omega(X;\mathfrak{w})$ is a finite dimensional $\Lambda^{\mathbb{C}}$ algebra and $\Lambda^{\mathbb{C}}$ is algebraically closed, we have an isomorphism

$$\frac{QH^\omega(X;\mathfrak{w})}{\mathrm{rad}} \cong (\Lambda^{\mathbb{C}})^k \tag{7.6}$$

for some k. (Here rad $= \{z \in QH^\omega(X;\mathfrak{w}) \mid z^N = 0 \quad \text{for some } N.\}$) Since there is a unique unital $\Lambda^{\mathbb{C}}$-algebra homomorphism : $QH^\omega(X;\mathfrak{w}) \to \Lambda^{\mathbb{C}}$, it follows that $k = 1$. Namely $QH^\omega(X;\mathfrak{w})$ is a local ring.

It also implies that $QH^\omega(X;\mathfrak{w})$ is indecomposable. □

The result up to here also works for the non-Fano case. But the next theorem will require the fact that X is Fano since we use the equality $QH^\omega(X;\Lambda) \cong QH(X;\Lambda)$.

Theorem 7.8. *If X is Fano then* $\mathrm{Crit}(\mathfrak{PO}_0) = \mathfrak{M}(\mathfrak{Lag}(X))$.

Proof. Let $\mathfrak{w}$ be a weight. We take $z \in QH^\omega(X;\mathfrak{w}) \subset H(X;\Lambda^{\mathbb{C}}) \cong H(X;\mathbb{C}) \otimes \Lambda^{\mathbb{C}}$. We may take z so that

$$z \in (H(X;\mathbb{C}) \otimes \Lambda_0^{\mathbb{C}}) \ \setminus (H(X;\mathbb{C}) \otimes \Lambda_+^{\mathbb{C}}).$$

Since

$$z_i \cup_Q z \equiv z_i \cup z \mod \Lambda_+^{\mathbb{C}},$$

where $\cup$ is the classical cup product. (We use $QH^\omega(X;\Lambda) = QH(X;\Lambda)$ here.) It follows that

$$\mathfrak{w}_i^n z = (\widehat{z_i})^n(z) = (z_i)^n \cup_Q z \equiv (z_i)^n \cup z \mod \Lambda_+^{\mathbb{C}}.$$

Therefore $\mathfrak{w}_i \in \Lambda_+^{\mathbb{C}}$ as $(z_i)^n \cup z = 0$. (7.3) and (7.5) then imply

$$\ell_i(u) = \mathfrak{v}_T(\mathfrak{w}_i) > 0.$$

Namely $u \in \mathrm{Int}P$. □

We are now ready to complete the proof of Theorem 1.12. (1) is Theorem 7.1. (2) is a consequence of Theorem 4.10. (3) is Theorem 7.8. If $QH^\omega(X;\Lambda^{\mathbb{C}})$ is semi-simple, then (7.6) and $k = 1$ there implies

$$QH^\omega(X;\Lambda^{\mathbb{C}}) \cong (\Lambda^{\mathbb{C}})^{\#W(X;\omega)} \tag{7.7}$$

as a $\Lambda^{\mathbb{C}}$ algebra. (4) follows from (7.7), Proposition 7.7 (2), and Theorem 7.1. The proof of Theorem 1.12 is complete. □

We next explain the factorization in Proposition 7.7 (1) from the point of view of Jacobian ring. Let $(\mathfrak{x}, u) \in \mathrm{Crit}(\mathfrak{PO}_0)$.

Definition 7.9. We consider the ideal generated by

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial w_i}\mathfrak{PO}_0^u(\mathfrak{y}_1 + w_1, \cdots, \mathfrak{y}_n + w_n) \tag{7.8}$$

$i = 1, \cdots, n$, in the ring $\Lambda[[w_1, \cdots, w_n]]$ of formal power series where $\mathfrak{x} = \sum \mathfrak{x}_i \mathbf{e}_i$ and $\mathfrak{y}_i = e^{\mathfrak{x}_i}$. We denote its quotient ring by $Jac(\mathfrak{PO}_0; \mathfrak{x}, u)$.

Proposition 7.10. (1) *There is a direct product decomposition :*

$$Jac(\mathfrak{PO}_0) \cong \prod_{(\mathfrak{x},u)\in \mathrm{Crit}(\mathfrak{PO}_0)} Jac(\mathfrak{PO}_0; \mathfrak{x}, u),$$

as a ring.

(2) *If $(\mathfrak{x}, u) \in \mathrm{Crit}(\mathfrak{PO}_0)$ corresponds to $\mathfrak{w} \in W(X;\omega)$ via the isomorphism given in Proposition 7.7 (2) and Theorem 7.1, then ψ_u induces an isomorphism*

$$\psi_u : QH^\omega(X;\mathfrak{w}) \cong Jac(\mathfrak{PO}_0; \mathfrak{x}, u).$$

(3) *$Jac(\mathfrak{PO}_0; \mathfrak{x}, u)$ is one dimensional (over Λ) if and only if the Hessian*

$$\left(\frac{\partial^2 \mathfrak{PO}_0^u}{\partial y_i \partial y_j}\right)_{i,j=1,\cdots,n}$$

is invertible over Λ at $\mathfrak{x}$.

Proof. We put $\mathfrak{x} = \sum \mathfrak{x}_i \mathbf{e}_i$ and $\mathfrak{y}_i = e^{\mathfrak{x}_i}$. Let $\mathfrak{m}(\mathfrak{x}, u)$ be the ideal generated by $y_i - \mathfrak{y}_i$, in the ring :

$$Jac(\mathfrak{PO}_0) = \frac{\Lambda[y_1^{\pm}, \cdots, y_n^{\pm}]}{(y_i \frac{\partial \mathfrak{PO}_0^u}{\partial y_i})}.$$

Since $Jac(\mathfrak{PO}_0)$ is finite dimensional over Λ it follows that

$$Jac(\mathfrak{PO}_0) \cong \prod_{(\mathfrak{x},u)\in \mathrm{Crit}(\mathfrak{PO}_0)} Jac(\mathfrak{PO}_0)_{\mathfrak{m}(\mathfrak{x},u)},$$

where $Jac(\mathfrak{PO}_0)_{\mathfrak{m}(\mathfrak{x},u)}$ is the localization of the ring $Jac(\mathfrak{PO}_0)$ at $\mathfrak{m}(\mathfrak{x}, u)$. Using finite dimensionality of $Jac(\mathfrak{PO}_0)$ again we have an isomorphism $Jac(\mathfrak{PO}_0)_{\mathfrak{m}(\mathfrak{x},u)} \cong Jac(\mathfrak{PO}_0; \mathfrak{x}, u)$ which sends $y_i - \mathfrak{y}_i$ to w_i. Here $\mathfrak{x} = \sum_i \mathfrak{x}_i \mathbf{e}_i$ and $\mathfrak{y}_i = e^{\mathfrak{x}_i}$ (1) follows.

Now we prove (2). If $z \in QH^\omega(X;\mathfrak{w})$ then $(\widehat{z}_i - \mathfrak{w}_i)^N z = 0$. Let $\pi_{\mathfrak{x},u} : Jac(\mathfrak{PO}_0) \to Jac(\mathfrak{PO}_0; \mathfrak{x}, u)$ be the projection. We then have

$$(T^{\ell_i(u)}\mathfrak{y}_1^{v_{i,1}} \cdots \mathfrak{y}_n^{v_{i,n}} - \mathfrak{w}_i)^N \pi_{\mathfrak{x},u}(\psi_u(z)) = 0. \tag{7.9}$$

We remark that

$$\mathfrak{w}_i = T^{\ell_i(u')}\mathfrak{y}_1'^{v_{i,1}} \cdots \mathfrak{y}_n'^{v_{i,n}} \tag{7.10}$$

if $\mathfrak{w}_i$ corresponds $(\mathfrak{x}', u')$ and $\mathfrak{y}_i'$ are exponential of the coordinates of $\mathfrak{x}'$. We define the operator $\widehat{\mathfrak{y}}_i : Jac(\mathfrak{PO}_0; \mathfrak{x}, u) \to Jac(\mathfrak{PO}_0; \mathfrak{x}, u)$ by

$$\widehat{\mathfrak{y}}_i(c) = \mathfrak{y}_i c.$$

By definition of $Jac(\mathfrak{PO}_0; \mathfrak{x}, u)$ the eigenvalue of $\widehat{\mathfrak{y}}_i$ is $\mathfrak{y}_i$. Therefore (7.9) and (7.10) imply that $\pi_{\mathfrak{x},u}(\psi_u(z)) = 0$ unless $(\mathfrak{x}, u) = (\mathfrak{x}', u')$. (2) follows.

Let us prove (3). We first remark $\Lambda = \Lambda^{\mathbb{C}}$ is an algebraically closed field (Lemma 14.1). Therefore $\dim_\Lambda Jac(\mathfrak{PO}_0; \mathfrak{x}, u) = 1$ if and only if the ideal generated by (7.8) (for $i = 1, \cdots, n$) is the maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m} = (w_1, \cdots, w_n)$. We remark that $\mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{m}^2 = \Lambda^n$ and elements (7.8) reduces to

$$\left(\frac{\partial^2 \mathfrak{PO}_0^u}{\partial y_i \partial y_j}\right)_{j=1,\cdots,n} \in \Lambda^n,$$

modulo $\mathfrak{m}^2$. (3) follows easily. □

We recall that a symplectic manifold (X, ω) is said to be (spherically) monotone if there exists $\lambda > 0$ such that $c_1(X) \cap \alpha = \lambda [\omega] \cap \alpha$ for all $\alpha \in \pi_2(X)$. Lagrangian submanifold L of (X, ω) is said to be monotone if there exists $\lambda > 0$ such that $\mu(\beta) = \lambda\omega(\beta)$ for any $\beta \in \pi_2(X, L)$. (Here μ is the Maslov index.) In the monotone case we have the following :

Theorem 7.11. *If X is a monotone compact toric manifold then there exists a unique u_0 such that*

$$\mathfrak{M}(\mathfrak{Lag}(X)) \subset \Lambda \times \{u_0\}$$

i.e., whenever $(\mathfrak{x}, u) \in \mathfrak{M}(\mathfrak{Lag}(X))$, $u = u_0$. Moreover $L(u_0)$ is monotone.

Remark 7.12. Related results are discussed in [EP1].

Proof. Since X is Fano, we have $QH^\omega(X; \Lambda) = QH(X; \Lambda)$. We assume $c_1(X) \cap \alpha = \lambda [\omega] \cap \alpha$ with $\lambda > 0$. Let $\cup_\alpha$ be the contribution to the moduli space of pseudo-holomorphic curve of homology class $\alpha \in H_2(X; \mathbb{Z})$ in the quantum cup product. (See (6.5).) We have a decomposition :

$$x \cup_Q y = x \cup y + \sum_{\alpha \in \pi_2(X) \setminus \{0\}} T^{\alpha \cap [\omega]/2\pi} x \cup_\alpha y.$$

Then

$$\deg(x \cup_\alpha y) = \deg x + \deg y - 2c_1(X) \cap \alpha = \deg x + \deg y - 2\lambda\alpha \cap [\omega]. \tag{7.11}$$

We define

$$\mathfrak{v}_{\deg}(T^{1/2\pi}) = 2\lambda, \quad \mathfrak{v}_{\deg}(x) = \deg x \quad (\text{for } x \in H(X; \mathbb{Q})).$$

$\mathfrak{v}_{\deg}$ is a multiplicative non-Archimedean valuation on $QH(X; \Lambda)$ such that $\mathfrak{v}_{\deg}(a \cup_Q b) = \mathfrak{v}_{\deg}(a) + \mathfrak{v}_{\deg}(b)$, by virtue of (7.11). Moreover for $c \in \Lambda$ and $a \in QH(X; \Lambda)$ we have $\mathfrak{v}_{\deg}(ca) = 2\lambda\mathfrak{v}_T(c) + \mathfrak{v}_{\deg}(a)$. Now let $\mathfrak{w}$ be a weight and $x \in QH^\omega(X; \mathfrak{w})$. Since $\mathfrak{v}_{\deg}(z_i) = 2$ it follows that

$$2\lambda\mathfrak{v}_T(\mathfrak{w}_i) + \mathfrak{v}_{\deg}(x) = \mathfrak{v}_{\deg}(z_i x) = 2 + \mathfrak{v}_{\deg}(x).$$

Therefore if $(\mathfrak{x}, u)$ corresponds to $\mathfrak{w}$ then $\ell_i(u) = \mathfrak{v}_T(\mathfrak{w}_i) = 1/\lambda$. Namely u is independent of $\mathfrak{w}$. We denote it by u_0.

For $\beta_i \in H_2(X, L(u_0))$ $(i = 1, \cdots, m)$ given by (6.7), we have $\omega(\beta_i) = 2\pi\ell_i(u_0) = 2\pi/\lambda$. Hence $\mu(\beta_i) = \lambda\omega(\beta_i)/\pi$. Since β_i generates $H_2(X, L(u_0))$, it follows that $L(u_0)$ is monotone, as required. □

So far we have studied Floer cohomology with $\Lambda^{\mathbb{C}}$-coefficients. We next consider the case of Λ^F coefficient where F is a finite Galois extension of $\mathbb{Q}$. We choose F so that each of the weight $\mathfrak{w}$ lies in $(\Lambda_0^F)^n$. (Since every finite extension of $\Lambda^{\mathbb{Q}}$ is contained in such Λ^F we can always find such an F. See appendix.) Then we have a decomposition

$$QH^\omega(X; \Lambda^F) \cong \prod_{\mathfrak{w} \in W(X;\omega)} QH^\omega(X; \mathfrak{w}; F). \tag{7.12}$$

It follows that the Galois group $Gal(F/\mathbb{Q})$ acts on $W(X;\omega)$. It induces a $Gal(F/\mathbb{Q})$ action on $\mathrm{Crit}(\mathfrak{P}\mathfrak{O}_0)$. (We use Remark 6.14 here.) We write it as $(\mathfrak{x}, u) \mapsto (\sigma(\mathfrak{x}), \sigma(u))$. We remark the following:

Proposition 7.13. (1) $\sigma(u) = u$.

(2) *We write by $y_i(\mathfrak{x})$ the exponential of the coordinates of $\mathfrak{x}$. Then $y_i(\mathfrak{x}) \in \Lambda^F$ and $y_i(\sigma(\mathfrak{x})) = \sigma(y_i(\mathfrak{x}))$.*

(3) *If $QH^\omega(X; \Lambda^{\mathbb{Q}})$ is indecomposable, there exists u_0 such that whenever $(\mathfrak{x}, u) \in \mathrm{Crit}(\mathfrak{P}\mathfrak{O}_0))$, $u = u_0$.*

Proof. Let $\mathfrak{w}_i(\mathfrak{x})$ corresponds to $(\mathfrak{x}, u)$. Then

$$\ell_i(\sigma(u)) = \mathfrak{v}_T(\mathfrak{w}_i(\sigma(\mathfrak{x}, u))) = \mathfrak{v}_T(\sigma\mathfrak{w}_i(\mathfrak{x}, u)) = \mathfrak{v}_T(\mathfrak{w}_i(\mathfrak{x}, u)) = \ell_i(u).$$

(1) follows. (2) follows from the definition and (1). (3) is a consequence of (1). □

A monotone blow up of $\mathbb{C}P^2$ (at one point) gives an example where the assumption of Proposition 7.13 (3) is satisfied.

It seems interesting to observe that the ring $QH(X; \Lambda^{\mathbb{Q}})$ jumps sometimes when we deform symplectic structure of X. The point where this jump occurs is closely related to the point where the number of balanced Lagrangian fibers jumps. In the case of Example 5.7 we have

$$QH(X; \Lambda^{\mathbb{Q}}) \cong \begin{cases} (\Lambda^{\mathbb{Q}})^5 & \alpha > 0, \\ (\Lambda^{\mathbb{Q}})^3 \times \Lambda^{\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{-3})} & \alpha < 0, \\ \Lambda^{\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{5})} \times \Lambda^F & \alpha = 0, \end{cases}$$

where $F = \mathbb{Q}[x]/(x^3 - x - 1)$. We remark that $x^5 + x^4 - 2x^3 - 2x^2 + 1 = (x^2 + x - 1)(x^3 - x - 1)$.

We also refer readers to Example 10.10 for further example.

Remark 7.14. In sections 11 - 13, we will use de Rham cohomology of Lagrangian submanifold to define and study Floer cohomology. As a consequence, our results on Floer cohomology is proved over $\Lambda_0^{\mathbb{R}}$ or $\Lambda_0^{\mathbb{C}}$ but not over $\Lambda_0^{\mathbb{Q}}$ or Λ_0^F. (The authors believe that those results can be also proved over $\Lambda_0^{\mathbb{Q}}$ by using the singular cohomology version developed in [FOOO3], although the detail of their proofs could be more complicated.)

On the other hand, Proposition 6.8 and Theorem 6.1 are proved over $\Lambda_0^{\mathbb{Q}}$. Therefore the discussion on quantum cohomology here works over Λ_0^F.

We also remark that, though Proposition 7.13 (3) is related to Floer cohomology, its proof given above does *not* use Floer cohomology over $\Lambda_0^{\mathbb{Q}}$ but uses only Floer

cohomology over $\Lambda_0^{\mathbb{C}}$ and quantum cohomology over $\Lambda_0^{\mathbb{Q}}$. In fact, the proof above implies the following : If $u \in \mathrm{Int}P$ and $\mathfrak{x} \in H^1(L(u); \Lambda_0^{\mathbb{C}})$ satisfy

$$\frac{\partial \mathfrak{PO}_0^u}{\partial x_i}(\mathfrak{x}) = 0$$

then $u = u_0$. This is because

$$Jac(\mathfrak{PO}_0^u; \Lambda_0^{\mathbb{C}}) = Jac(\mathfrak{PO}_0^u; \Lambda_0^{\mathbb{Q}}) \otimes_{\Lambda_0^{\mathbb{Q}}} \Lambda_0^{\mathbb{C}}$$

and

$$Jac(\mathfrak{PO}_0^u; \Lambda_0^{\mathbb{Q}}) \cong QH(X; \Lambda^{\mathbb{Q}}).$$

8. Further examples and remarks

In this section we show how we can use the argument of the last 2 sections to illustrate calculations of $\mathfrak{M}(\mathfrak{Lag}(X))$ in examples.

Example 8.1. We consider one point blow up X of $\mathbb{C}P^2$. We choose its Kähler form so that the moment polytope is

$$P = \{(u_1, u_2) \mid 0 \le u_1, u_2,\ u_1 + u_2 \le 1,\ u_2 \le 1 - \alpha\},$$

$0 < \alpha < 1$. The potential function is

$$\mathfrak{PO} = y_1 T^{u_1} + y_2 T^{u_2} + (y_1 y_2)^{-1} T^{1-u_1-u_2} + y_2^{-1} T^{1-\alpha-u_2}.$$

We put $\overline{z}_1 = y_1 T^{u_1}$, $\overline{z}_2 = y_2 T^{u_2}$, $\overline{z}_3 = (y_1 y_2)^{-1} T^{1-u_1-u_2}$, $\overline{z}_4 = y_2^{-1} T^{1-\alpha-u_2}$.

The quantum Stanley-Reisner relation is

$$\overline{z}_1 \overline{z}_3 = \overline{z}_4 T^{\alpha}, \quad \overline{z}_2 \overline{z}_4 = T^{1-\alpha}, \tag{8.1}$$

and linear relation is

$$\overline{z}_1 - \overline{z}_3 = 0, \quad \overline{z}_2 - \overline{z}_3 - \overline{z}_4 = 0. \tag{8.2}$$

We put $X = \overline{z}_1$ and $Y = \overline{z}_2$ and solve (8.1), (8.2). We obtain

$$X^3(T^{\alpha} + X) = T^{1+\alpha}, \tag{8.3}$$

with $Y = X + T^{-\alpha} X^2$. We consider valuations of both sides of (8.3). There are three different cases to consider.

Case 1; $\mathfrak{v}_T(X) > \alpha$: (8.3) implies $3\mathfrak{v}_T(X) + \alpha = 1 + \alpha$. Namely $\mathfrak{v}_T(X) = 1/3$. So $\alpha < 1/3$. Moreover $\mathfrak{v}_T(Y) = 1/3$. We have $u_1 = \mathfrak{v}_T(X) = 1/3$, $u_2 = \mathfrak{v}_T(Y) = 1/3$. (See Lemma 7.3.) Writing $X = a_1 T^{1/3} + a_2 T^{\lambda} +$ higher order terms with $\lambda > \frac{1}{3}$ and substituting this into (8.3), we obtain $a_1^3 = 1$ which has 3 simple roots. Each of them corresponds to the solution for $\mathfrak{x}$ by Hensel's lemma (see Proposition 3 in p 144 [BGR], for example). (It also follows from Theorem 10.4 in section 10.)

Case 2; $\mathfrak{v}_T(X) < \alpha$: By taking the valuation of (8.3) we obtain $u_1 = \mathfrak{v}_T(X) = (1 + \alpha)/4$. Hence $\alpha > 1/3$. Moreover $u_2 = \mathfrak{v}_T(Y) = (1 - \alpha)/2$. In the same way as Case 1, we can check that there are four solutions.

Case 3; $\mathfrak{v}_T(X) = \alpha$: We put $X = a_1 T^{\alpha} + a_2 T^{\lambda} +$ higher order terms where $\lambda > \alpha$. (Case 3-1: $a_1 \neq -1$) : By taking valuation of (8.3), we obtain $u_1 = \mathfrak{v}_T(X) = 1/3$. Then $\alpha = 1/3$ and $u_2 = \mathfrak{v}_T(Y) = 1/3$. (8.3) becomes

$$a_1^4 + a_1^3 - 1 = 0. \tag{8.4}$$

(In this case $X = a_1 T^{\alpha}$ has no higher term.) There are four solutions. We remark that (8.4) is irreducible over $\mathbb{Q}$, since it is so over $\mathbb{Z}_2$. Namely the assumption of

Proposition 7.13 (3) is satisfied. Actually X is monotone in the case $\alpha = 1/3$. Hence the same conclusion (uniqueness of u) follows from Theorem 7.11 also.
(Case 3-2: $a_1 = -1$) : By taking valuation of (8.3), we obtain $\lambda = 1 - 2\alpha$. $\lambda > \alpha$ implies $\alpha < 1/3$. $u_2 = \mathfrak{v}_T(Y) = 1 - 2\alpha$. ($u_1 = \mathfrak{v}_T(X) = \alpha$.) There is one solution.

In summary, if $\alpha < 1/3$ there are two choices of $u = (\alpha, 1 - 2\alpha), (1/3, 1/3)$. On the other hand the numbers of choices of $\mathfrak{x}$ are 1 and 3 respectively.

If $\alpha \geq 1/3$ there is the unique choice $u = ((1 + \alpha)/4, (1 - \alpha)/2)$. The number of choices of $\mathfrak{x}$ is 4.

We next study a non-Fano case. We will study Hirzebruch surface F_n. Note F_1 is one point blow up of $\mathbb{C}P^2$ which we have already studied. We leave the case F_2 to the reader.

Example 8.2. We consider Hirzebruch surface F_n, $n \geq 3$. We take its Kähler form so that the moment polytope is

$$P = \{(u_1, u_2) \mid 0 \leq u_1, u_2,\ u_1 + nu_2 \leq n,\ u_2 \leq 1 - \alpha\},$$

$0 < \alpha < 1$. The leading order potential function is

$$\mathfrak{PO}_0 = y_1 T^{u_1} + y_2 T^{u_2} + y_1^{-1} y_2^{-n} T^{n-u_1-nu_2} + y_2^{-1} T^{1-\alpha-u_2}.$$

We put $\overline{z}_1 = y_1 T^{u_1}$, $\overline{z}_2 = y_2 T^{u_2}$, $\overline{z}_3 = y_1^{-1} y_2^{-n} T^{n-u_1-nu_2}$, $\overline{z}_4 = y_2^{-1} T^{1-\alpha-u_2}$.

The quantum Stanley-Reisner relation and linear relation gives

$$\overline{z}_1 \overline{z}_3 = \overline{z}_4^n T^{n\alpha}, \qquad \overline{z}_2 \overline{z}_4 = T^{1-\alpha}, \tag{8.5}$$

$$\overline{z}_1 - \overline{z}_3 = 0, \qquad \overline{z}_2 - n\overline{z}_3 - \overline{z}_4 = 0. \tag{8.6}$$

Let us assume n is odd. We put

$$\overline{z}_1 = Z^n, \qquad \overline{z}_4 = Z^2 T^{-\alpha}.$$

(In case $n = 2n'$ is even we put $\overline{z}_1 = Z^{n'}$, $\overline{z}_4 = \pm Z T^{-\alpha}$. The rest of the argument are similar and is omitted.) Then $\overline{z}_2 = T^{-\alpha} Z^2 + nZ^n$ and

$$Z^4(nZ^{n-2} + T^{-\alpha}) = T. \tag{8.7}$$

Case 1 ; $(n-2)\mathfrak{v}_T(Z) > -\alpha$: In the first case, we have $\mathfrak{v}_T(Z) = (\alpha+1)/4$. (Then $(n-2)\mathfrak{v}_T(Z) > -\alpha$ is automatically satisfied.) Therefore $u_1 = \mathfrak{v}_T(z_1) = n(\alpha+1)/4$, $u_2 = \mathfrak{v}_T(z_2) = (1-\alpha)/2$. We also can check that there are 4 solutions. We remark that we are using $\mathfrak{PO}_0$ in place of $\mathfrak{PO}$. However we can use Corollary 10.6 to prove the following lemma. This lemma in particular implies that $L(n(\alpha+1)/4, (1-\alpha)/2)$ is balanced which was already shown above in Example 8.1 for the case $n = 1$.

Lemma 8.3. *Let $y^{(i)} \in \Lambda_0 \times \Lambda_0$ ($i = 1, \cdots, 4$) be critical points $\mathfrak{PO}_0^u$ for $u = (n(\alpha+1)/4, (1-\alpha)/2)$. Then there exists $y^{(i)\prime} \in \Lambda_0 \times \Lambda_0$ which is a critical point of $\mathfrak{PO}^u$ and $y^{(i)} \equiv y^{(i)\prime} \mod \Lambda_+$.*

We will prove Lemma 8.3 in section 10.

Case 2 ; $(n-2)\mathfrak{v}_T(Z) < -\alpha$: We have $v_T(Z) = 1/(n+2)$. This can never occur since $1/(n+2) > 0 > -\alpha/(n-2)$.

Case 3 ; $(n-2)\mathfrak{v}_T(Z) = -\alpha$: We put $Z = a_1 T^{-\alpha/(n-2)} + a_2 T^{\lambda}+$ higher order term.

(Case 3-1 : $na_1^{n-2} \neq -1$) : Then $\mathfrak{v}_T(Z) = (\alpha+1)/4$. Since $(\alpha+1)/4 \neq -\alpha/(n-2)$, this case never occur.

(Case 3-2 : $na_1^{n-2} = -1$) : We have $4v_T(Z) + (n-3)v_T(Z) + \lambda = 1$. Therefore

$$\lambda = \frac{n-2+(n+1)\alpha}{n-2}.$$

We have

$$u_1 = v_T(z_1) = -\frac{n\alpha}{n-2}, \qquad u_2 = v_T(z_2) = 1-\alpha-v_T(z_4) = \frac{n-2+2\alpha}{n-2}.$$

Thus (u_1, u_2) is *not* in the moment polytope.

In Example 8.2, we have

$$\mathfrak{M}(\mathfrak{Lag}(X)) = \mathfrak{M}_0(\mathfrak{Lag}(X)) \neq \mathrm{Crit}(\mathfrak{PO}_0).$$

On the other hand, the order of $\mathfrak{M}(\mathfrak{Lag}(X))$ is 4 and is equal to the sum of Betti numbers.

Remark 8.4. In a sequel of this series of papers, we will prove the equality

$$\sum_d \operatorname{rank} H_d(X;\mathbb{Q}) = \#(\mathfrak{M}(\mathfrak{Lag}(X)))$$

for any compact toric manifold X (which is not necessarily Fano) such that $QH(X;\Lambda)$ is semi-simple. If we count the right hand side with multiplicity, the same equality holds without assuming semi-simplicity.

We next discuss the version of the above story where we substitute some explicit number into the formal variable T. Let $u \in \mathrm{Int}P$. We define a Laurent polynomial

$$\mathfrak{PO}^u_{0,T=t} \in \mathbb{C}[y_1, \cdots, y_n, y_1^{-1}, \cdots, y_n^{-1}]$$

by substituting a complex number $t \in \mathbb{C}\backslash\{0\}$. In the same way we define the algebra $QH^\omega(X; T=t; \mathbb{C})$ over $\mathbb{C}$ by substituting $T = t$ in the quantum Stanley-Reisner relation. The argument of section 6 goes through to show

$$QH^\omega(X; T=t; \mathbb{C}) \cong Jac(\mathfrak{PO}^u_{0,T=t}). \tag{8.8}$$

In particular the right hand side is independent of u up to an isomorphism. Here the $\mathbb{C}$-algebra in the right hand side of (8.8) is the quotient of the polynomial ring $\mathbb{C}[y_1, \cdots, y_n, y_1^{-1}, \cdots, y_n^{-1}]$ by the ideal generated by $\partial\mathfrak{PO}_{0,T=t}/\partial y_i$. $(i = 1, \cdots, n.)$

We remark that right hand side of (8.8) is always nonzero, for small t, by Proposition 4.7. It follows that the equation

$$\frac{\partial \mathfrak{PO}^u_{0,T=t}}{\partial y_i} = 0 \tag{8.9}$$

has a solution $y_i \neq 0$ for *any* u. Namely, as far as the Floer cohomology after $T = t$ substituted, there *always* exists $b \in H^1(X;\mathbb{C})$ with nonvanishing Floer cohomology $HF((L(u),b),(L(u),b);\mathbb{C})$ for any $u \in \mathrm{Int}P$. Since the version of Floer cohomology after substituting $T = t$ is *not* invariant under the Hamiltonian isotopy, this is not useful for the application to symplectic topology. (Compare this with section 14.2 [CO].)

The relation between the set of solutions of (8.9) and that of (4.10) is stated as follows : Let $(y_1^{(c)}(t;u), \cdots, y_n^{(c)}(t;u))$ be a branch of the solutions of (8.9) for $t \neq 0$ where c is an integer with $1 \leq c \leq l$ for some $l \in \mathbb{N}$. We can easily show that it is a holomorphic function of t on $\mathbb{C}\setminus\mathbb{R}_-$. We consider its behavior as $t \to 0$. For generic

u the limit either diverges or converges to 0. However if $(\mathfrak{x}, u) \in \mathfrak{M}_0(\mathfrak{Lag}(X))$ and $\mathfrak{x} = \sum x_i \mathbf{e}_i$ then there is some c such that

$$\lim_{t\to 0} y_i^{(c)}(t;u) \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\} \quad \text{and that} \quad y_i^{(c)}(t;u) = e^{x_i(t)}.$$

To prove this claim it suffices to show that if $(\mathfrak{x}, u) \in \mathrm{Crit}(\mathfrak{PO}_0)$ and $\mathfrak{x} = \sum x_i \mathbf{e}_i$, $y_i = e^{x_i}$, $y_i = \sum_j y_{ij} T^{\lambda_{ij}}$ then $\sum_j y_{ij} t^{\lambda_{ij}}$ converges for $0 < |t| < \epsilon$. (Here ϵ is sufficiently small positive number.) This follows from the following Lemma 8.5. Let Λ_0^{conv} be the ring

$$\left\{ \sum_i a_i T^{\lambda_i} \in \Lambda_0^{\mathbb{C}} \;\middle|\; \exists \epsilon > 0 \text{ such that } \sum_i |a_i||t|^{\lambda_i} \text{ converges for } |t| < \epsilon. \right\}$$

and Λ^{conv} be its field of fractions. We put $\Lambda_+^{conv} = \Lambda_0^{conv} \cap \Lambda_+$.

Lemma 8.5. *The field Λ^{conv} is algebraically closed.*

We will prove Lemma 8.5 in section 14.

We go back to the discussion on the difference between two sets $\mathfrak{M}_0(\mathfrak{Lag}(X))$ and $\mathrm{Crit}(\mathfrak{PO}_0)$. (See Definition 1.11 for its definition.) The rest of this section owes much to the discussion with H. Iritani and also to his papers [Iri1], [Iri2]. The results we describe below will not be used in the other part of this paper.

We recall that we did *not* take closure of the ideal $(P(X)+SR_\omega(X))$ in section 6. This is actually the reason why we have $\mathfrak{M}_0(\mathfrak{Lag}(X)) \neq \mathrm{Crit}(\mathfrak{PO}_0)$. More precisely we have the following Proposition 8.6.

We consider the polynomial ring $\Lambda[z_1, \cdots, z_m]$. We define its norm $\|\cdot\|$ so that

$$\left\| \sum_{\vec{i}} a_{\vec{i}} z_1^{i_1} \cdots z_m^{i_m} \right\| = \exp\left(- \inf_{\vec{i}} \mathfrak{v}_T(a_{\vec{i}}) \right).$$

We take the closure of the ideal $(P(X) + SR_\omega(X))$ with respect to this norm and denote it by $\mathrm{Clos}(P(X) + SR_\omega(X))$. We put

$$\overline{QH}^\omega(X;\Lambda) = \frac{\Lambda[z_1, \cdots, z_m]}{\mathrm{Clos}(P(X) + SR_\omega(X))}. \tag{8.10}$$

Let $W^{\mathrm{geo}}(X;\omega)$ be the set of all weight such that the corresponding $(\mathfrak{x}, u)$ satisfies $u \in \mathrm{Int}\, P$. We remark that $\mathfrak{w} \in W^{\mathrm{geo}}(X;\omega)$ if and only if $\mathfrak{v}_T(\mathfrak{w}_i) > 0$ for all i.

Proposition 8.6 (Iritani)**.** *There exists an isomorphism*

$$\overline{QH}^\omega(X;\Lambda^{\mathbb{C}}) \cong \prod_{\mathfrak{w} \in W^{\mathrm{geo}}(X;\omega)} QH^\omega(X;\mathfrak{w}).$$

Proof. Let $\mathfrak{w} \in W(X;\omega) \setminus W^{\mathrm{geo}}(X;\omega)$. We first assume $\mathfrak{v}_T(\mathfrak{w}_i) = -\lambda < 0$. (The case $\mathfrak{v}_T(\mathfrak{w}_i) = 0$ will be discussed at the end of the proof.)

Then, there exists $f \in \Lambda_0 \setminus \Lambda_+$ such that $T^\lambda f \mathfrak{w}_i = 1$. Let $x \in QH^\omega(X;\mathfrak{w})$. We assume $x \neq 0$. We take k such that $(\widehat{z}_i - \mathfrak{w}_i)^k x \neq 0$, $(\widehat{z}_i - \mathfrak{w}_i)^{k+1} x = 0$ and replace x by $(\widehat{z}_i - \mathfrak{w}_i)^k x$. We then have $T^\lambda f \widehat{z}_i x = x$. Since $\lim_{N\to\infty} \|(f z_i T^\lambda)^N\| = 0$, it follows that $x = 0$ in $\overline{QH}^\omega(X;\Lambda^{\mathbb{C}})$. This is a contradiction.

We next assume $\mathfrak{v}_T(\mathfrak{w}_i) > 0$ for all i. We consider the homomorphism

$$\varphi : \Lambda[z_1, \cdots, z_m] \to Hom_\Lambda(QH^\omega(X;\mathfrak{w}), QH^\omega(X;\mathfrak{w})),$$

defined by

$$\varphi(z_i)(x) = z_i \cup_Q x.$$

We have $\varphi(P(X) + SR_\omega(X)) = 0$. We may choose the basis of $QH^\omega(X;\mathfrak{w})$ so that $\varphi(z_i)$ is upper triangular matrix whose diagonal entries are all $\mathfrak{w}_i$ and whose off diagonal entries are all 0 or 1. We use it and $\mathfrak{v}_T(\mathfrak{w}_i) > 0$ to show that $\varphi(\mathrm{Clos}(P(X) + SR_\omega(X))) = 0$. Namely φ induces a homomorphism from $\overline{QH}^\omega(X;\Lambda)$. It follows easily that the restriction of the projection $QH^\omega(X;\Lambda^{\mathbb{C}}) \to \overline{QH}^\omega(X;\Lambda^{\mathbb{C}})$ to $QH^\omega(X;\mathfrak{w})$ is an isomorphism to its image.

We finally show that for $u \in \partial P$, there is no critical point of $\mathfrak{PO}_0$ on $(\Lambda_0 \setminus \Lambda_+)^n$. Let

$$u \in \bigcup_{i \in I} \partial_i P \setminus \bigcup_{i \notin I} \partial_i P_i.$$

Then

$$\mathfrak{PO}_0^u \equiv \sum_{i \in I} y_1^{v_{i,1}} \cdots y_n^{v_{i,n}} \mod \Lambda_+.$$

We remark that v_i $(i \in I)$ is a part of the $\mathbb{Z}$ basis of $\mathbb{Z}^n$, since X is nonsingular toric. Hence by changing the variables to appropriate y_i' it is easy to see that there is no nonzero critical point of $\sum_{i \in I} y_1^{v_{i,1}} \cdots y_n^{v_{i,n}} = \sum_{i \in I'} y_i'$. The proof of Proposition 8.6 is now complete. □

To further discuss the relationship between the contents of sections 6 and 7 and those in [Iri2], we compare the coefficient rings used here and in [Iri2]. In [Iri2] (like many of the literatures on quantum cohomology such as [Gi1]) the formal power series ring $\mathbb{Q}[[q_1, \cdots, q_{m-n}]]$ is taken as the coefficient ring. $(m - n$ is the rank of $H^2(X;\mathbb{Q})$ and we choose a basis of it.) The superpotential in [Iri2] (which is the same as the one used in [Gi1]) is given as [2]

$$F_q = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \left(\prod_{a=1}^{m-n} q_a^{l_{a,i}} \prod_{j=1}^{n} s_j^{v_{i,j}} \right). \tag{8.11}$$

Here $l_{a,i}$ is a matrix element of a splitting of $H_2(X;\mathbb{Z}) \to H_2(X, T^n;\mathbb{Z})$. We will show that (8.11) pulls back to our potential function $\mathfrak{PO}_0^u$ after a simple change of variables. Let $\alpha_a \in H_2(X;\mathbb{Z})$ be the basis we have chosen. (We choose it so that $[\omega] \cap \alpha_a$ is positive.)

Lemma 8.7. *There exists $f_j(u) \in \mathbb{R}$ $(j = 1, \cdots, n)$ such that*

$$\frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_a l_{a,i} [\omega] \cap \alpha_a = \ell_i(u) - \sum_{j=1}^{n} v_{i,j} f_j(u).$$

Proof. We consider the exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow H_2(X;\mathbb{Z}) \xrightarrow{i_*} H_2(X, L(u);\mathbb{Z}) \longrightarrow H_1(L(u);\mathbb{Z}) \longrightarrow 0.$$

$(c_1, \cdots, c_m) \in H_2(X, L(u);\mathbb{Z})$ is in the image of $H_2(X;\mathbb{Z})$ if and only if $\sum_i c_i v_i = 0$. (Here $v_i = (v_{i,1}, \cdots, v_{i,n}) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$.) For given $\alpha \in H_2(X, \mathbb{Z})$ denote $i_*(\alpha) = (c_1, \cdots, c_m)$. Then we have

$$\sum_a [\omega] \cap c_i l_{a,i} \alpha_a = [\omega] \cap \alpha = 2\pi \sum c_i \ell_i(u).$$

[2] We change the notation so that it is consistent to ours. $m, n, v_{i,j}$ here corresponds to $r + N$, r, $x_{i,b}$ in [Iri2], respectively.

This implies the lemma. □

We now put

$$q_a = T^{[\omega]\cap\alpha_a/2\pi}, \qquad s_j(u) = T^{f_j(u)}y_j. \tag{8.12}$$

We obtain the identity

$$F_q(s_1(u),\cdots,s_n(u)) = \mathfrak{PO}_0^u(y_1,\cdots,y_n). \tag{8.13}$$

We remark that if we change the choice of Kähler form then the identification (8.12) changes. In other words, the story over $\mathbb{Q}[[q_1,\cdots,q_{m-n}]]$ corresponds to studying all the symplectic structures simultaneously, while the story over Λ focuses on one particular symplectic structure.

In [Iri2] Corollary 5.12, Iritani proved semi-simplicity of quantum cohomology ring of toric manifold with coefficient ring $\mathbb{Q}[[q_1,\cdots,q_{m-n}]]$. It does not imply the semi-simplicity of our $QH^\omega(X;\Lambda)$ since the semi-simplicity in general is not preserved by the pull-back. (On the other way round, semi-simplicity follows from semi-simplicity of the pull-back.) However it is preserved by the pull-back at a generic point. Namely we have:

Proposition 8.8. *The set of T^n-invariant symplectic structures on X for which $Jac(\mathfrak{PO}_0^u)$ is semi-simple is open and dense.*

Proof. We give a proof for completeness, following the argument in the proof of Proposition 5.11 [Iri2]. Consider the polynomial

$$F_{w_1,\cdots,w_m} = \sum_{i=1}^m w_i y_1^{v_{i,1}}\cdots y_n^{v_{i,n}}$$

where $w_i \in \mathbb{C}\setminus\{0\}$. By Kushnirenko's theorem [Ku] the Jacobian ring of $F_{w_1,\cdots,w_m}$ is semi-simple for a generic $w_1,\cdots,w_m$. We put

$$w_i = \exp\left(\frac{1}{2\pi}\sum_a l_{a,i}[\omega]\cap\alpha + \sum_j v_{i,j}f_j(u)\right).$$

It is easy to see that when we move $[\omega]\cap\alpha_a$ and u (there are $m-n$, n parameters respectively) then w_i moves in an arbitrary way. Therefore for generic choice of ω and u, the Jacobian ring $Jac(\mathfrak{PO}_0^u)$ is semi-simple. Since $Jac(\mathfrak{PO}_0^u)$ is independent of u up to isomorphism, the proposition follows. □

Remark 8.9. Combined with Theorem 1.9, this proposition gives a partial answer to Question in section 3 [EP2].

9. Variational analysis of potential function

In this section, we prove Proposition 4.7. Let $\mathfrak{PO}$ be defined as in (4.7).

We define

$$s_1(u) = \inf\{\ell_i(u) \mid i = 1,\cdots,m\}.$$

s_1 is a continuous, piecewise affine and convex function and $s_1 \equiv 0$ on ∂P. Recall if $u \in \partial_i P$ then $\ell_i(u) = 0$ by definition.

We put

$$S_1 = \sup\{s_1(u) \mid u \in P\},$$
$$P_1 = \{u \in P \mid s_1(u) = S_1\}.$$

Proposition 9.1. *There exist s_k, S_k, and P_k with the following properties.*

(1) P_{k+1} *is a convex polyhedron in* $M_{\mathbb{R}}$. $\dim P_{k+1} \leq \dim P_k$.
(2) $s_{k+1} : P_k \to \mathbb{R}$ *is a continuous, convex piecewise affine function.*
(3) $s_{k+1}(u) = \inf\{\ell_i(u) \mid \ell_i(u) > S_k\}$ *for* $u \in \mathrm{Int}P_k$.
(4) $s_{k+1}(u) = S_k$ *for* $u \in \partial P_k$.
(5) $S_{k+1} = \sup\{s_{k+1}(u) \mid u \in P_k\}$.
(6) $P_{k+1} = \{u \in P_k \mid s_{k+1}(u) = S_{k+1}\}$.
(7) $P_{k+1} \subset \mathrm{Int}P_k$.
(8) s_k, S_k, P_k *are defined for* $k = 1, 2, \cdots, K$ *for some* $K \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ *and* P_K *consists of a single point.*

Example 9.2. Let $P = [0, a]\times[0, b]$ $(a < b.)$ Then $s_1(u_1, u_2) = \inf\{u_1, u_2, a-u_1, b-u_2\}$. $S_1 = a/2$, $P_1 = \{(a/2, u_2) \mid a/2 \leq u_2 \leq b - a/2\}$, $s_2(1/2, u_2) = \inf\{u_2, b - u_2\}$, $S_2 = b/2$, $P_2 = \{(a/2, b/2)\}$.

Proof. We define s_k, S_k, P_k inductively over k. We assume that s_k, S_k, P_k are defined for $k = 1, \cdots, k_0$ so that (1) - (7) of Proposition 9.1 are satisfied for $k = 1, \cdots, k_0 - 1$.

We define s_{k_0+1} by (3) and (4). We will prove that it satisfies (2). We use the following lemma for this purpose.

Lemma 9.3. *Let* $u_j \in \mathrm{Int}P_{k_0}$ *and* $\lim_{j\to\infty} u_j = u_\infty \in \partial P_{k_0}$. *Then*

$$\lim_{j\to\infty} s_{k_0+1}(u_j) = S_{k_0}.$$

Proof. We put

$$I'_{k_0} = \{\ell_i | \ell_i(u_\infty) = S_{k_0}\}. \tag{9.1}$$

By (6) for $k = k_0 - 1$, we find that $s_{k_0}(u_\infty) = S_{k_0}$. Then (3) for $k = k_0 - 1$ implies that there is ℓ_i such that $\ell_i(u_\infty) = S_{k_0}$. Thus I'_{k_0} is non-empty. We take the affine space $A_{k_0} \subset M_{\mathbb{R}}$ such that $\mathrm{Int}P_{k_0}$ is relatively open in A_{k_0}.

Now since $u_\infty \in \partial P_{k_0}$, we can take a $\vec{u} \in T_{u_\infty} A_{k_0}$ such that $u_\infty + \epsilon\vec{u} \notin P_{k_0}$ for any sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$. It follows from (7) for $k = k_0 - 1$ that $u_\infty + \epsilon\vec{u} \in \mathrm{Int}\, P_{k_0-1}$, and hence $u + \epsilon\vec{u} \in \mathrm{Int}\, P_{k_0-1} \setminus P_{k_0}$.

By definition, we also have $s_{k_0}(u) \leq S_{k_0}$ for all $u \in P_{k_0-1}$. Therefore we have

$$s_{k_0}(u_\infty + \epsilon\vec{u}) < S_{k_0}.$$

It follows that there exists $\ell_i \in I'_{k_0}$ such that

$$\ell_i(u_\infty + \epsilon\vec{u}) < \ell_i(u_\infty) = S_{k_0} < \ell_i(u_\infty - \epsilon\vec{u}). \tag{9.2}$$

Since (9.2) holds for any $\vec{u} \in T_{u_\infty} A_{k_0}$ with $u_\infty + \epsilon\vec{u} \notin P_{k_0}$, it holds for $\epsilon\vec{u} := u_j - u_\infty$ for any sufficiently large j. We note that since $u_j \in \mathrm{Int}\, P_{k_0} \subset A_{k_0}$, $\vec{u}_j = u_\infty - u_j$ is an 'outward' vector as a tangent vector in $T_{u_\infty} A_{k_0}$ at $u_\infty \in \partial P_{k_0}$. Therefore we have $u_\infty + \vec{u}_j \notin P_{k_0}$. Because $u_j = u_\infty - \vec{u}_j$, it follows from (9.2) that

$$\ell_i(u_j) > S_{k_0} \tag{9.3}$$

for any sufficiently large j. Therefore we have

$$s_{k_0+1}(u_j) = \inf\{\ell_i(u_j) \mid \ell_i \in I'_{k_0},\ \ell_i(u_j) > S_{k_0}\} \tag{9.4}$$

and $\lim_{j\to\infty} s_{k_0+1}(u_j) = \lim_{j\to\infty} \ell_i(u_j) = \ell_i(u_\infty) = S_{k_0}$. This finishes the proof of the lemma. □

Lemma 9.3 implies that s_{k_0+1} is continuous and piecewise linear in a neighborhood of ∂P_{k_0}. We can then check (2) easily.

We define S_{k_0+1} by (5). Then we can define P_{k_0+1} by (6). (In other words the right hand side of (6) is nonempty.) (7) is a consequence of Lemma 9.3. We can easily check that P_{k_0+1} satisfies (1).

We finally prove that P_K becomes a point for some K. Let $\mathbf{u}_k \in \operatorname{Int} P_k$ and put

$$I_k = \{\ell_i \mid \ell_i(\mathbf{u}_k) = S_k\}. \tag{9.5}$$

Here $k = 1, \cdots, K$. We remark that I_k is independent of the choice of $\mathbf{u}_k \in \operatorname{Int} P_k$.

Note we defined I'_{k_0} by the formula (9.1). We have $I_{k_0} \subseteq I'_{k_0}$. But the equality may not hold in general. In fact u_∞ in the boundary of P_{k_0} but $\mathbf{u}_{k_0}$ is an interior point of P_{k_0}. Therefore if $\ell_i \in I_{k_0}$ then ℓ_i is constant on P_{k_0}. But element of I'_{k_0} may not have this property.

In case some $\ell_i \in I_{k_0+1}$ is not constant on P_{k_0} it is easy to see that $\dim P_{k_0+1} < \dim P_{k_0}$. We remark that there exists some $\ell_j \notin \bigcup_{k \le k_0} I_{k_0}$ which is not constant on S_{k_0} unless S_{k_0} is a point. Therefore if $\dim S_{k_0} \neq 0$, there exists $k' > k_0$ such that $\dim P_{k'} < \dim P_{k_0}$. Therefore there exists K such that P_K becomes 0-dimensional (namely a point). Hence we have achieved (8). The proof of Proposition 9.1 is now complete. □

Remark 9.4. In a recent preprint [Mc], McDuff pointed out an error in the statement (1) of Proposition 9.1 in the previous version of this paper. We have corrected the statement and modified the last paragraph of its proof, following the corresponding argument in section 2.2 of [Mc]. We thank her for pointing out this error.

The next lemma easily follows from construction.

Lemma 9.5. *If all the vertices of P lie in $\mathbb{Q}^n$ then $u_0 \in \mathbb{Q}^n$. Here $\{u_0\} = P_K$.*

By parallelly translating the polytope, we may assume, without loss of generality, that $u_0 = \mathbf{0}$, the origin. In the rest of this subsection, we will prove that $\mathfrak{PO}^{\mathbf{0}}$ has a critical point on $(\Lambda_0 \setminus \Lambda_+)^n$. More precisely we prove Proposition 4.7 for $u_0 = \mathbf{0}$. (We remark that if P and ℓ_i are given we can easily locate u_0.)

Example 9.6. Let us consider Example 8.1 in the case $\alpha > 1/3$. At $u_0 = ((1+\alpha)/4, (1-\alpha)/2)$ we have

$$\mathfrak{PO}^{u_0} = (y_2 + y_2^{-1})T^{(1-\alpha)/2} + (y_1 + (y_1y_2)^{-1})T^{(1+\alpha)/4}.$$

Therefore the constant term $\mathfrak{y}_{i;0}$ of the coordinate y_i of the critical point is given by

$$1 - \mathfrak{y}_{2;0}^{-2} = 0, \quad 1 - \mathfrak{y}_{1;0}^{-2}\mathfrak{y}_{2;0}^{-1} = 0. \tag{9.6}$$

Note the first equation comes from the term of the smallest exponent and contains only $\mathfrak{y}_{2;0}$. The second equation comes from the term which has second smallest exponent and contains both $\mathfrak{y}_{1;0}$ and $\mathfrak{y}_{2;0}$. So we need to solve the equation inductively according to the order of the exponent. This is the situation we want to work out in general.

We remark that the affine space A_i defined above in the proof of Lemma 9.3

$$M_{\mathbb{R}} = A_0 \supseteq A_1 \supseteq \cdots \supseteq A_{K-1} \supseteq A_K = \{\mathbf{0}\}$$

is a nonincreasing sequence of linear subspaces such that $\operatorname{Int} P_k$ is an open subset of A_k. Let

$$A_l^{\perp} \subset (M_{\mathbb{R}})^* \cong N_{\mathbb{R}}$$

be the annihilator of $A_l \subset M_{\mathbb{R}}$. Then we have

$$\{\mathbf{0}\} = A_0^\perp \subseteq A_1^\perp \subseteq \cdots \subseteq A_{K-1}^\perp \subseteq A_K^\perp = N_{\mathbb{R}}.$$

We recall:

$$I_k = \{\ell_i \mid \ell_i(\mathbf{0}) = S_k\}, \tag{9.7}$$

for $k = 1, \cdots, K$. In fact $\mathbf{0} \in P_{k+1} \subseteq \operatorname{Int} P_k$ for $k < K$.

We renumber each of I_k in (9.7) so that

$$\{\ell_{k,j} \mid j = 1, \cdots, a(k)\} = I_k. \tag{9.8}$$

By construction

$$s_k(u) = \inf_j \ell_{k,j}(u) \tag{9.9}$$

in a neighborhood of $\mathbf{0}$ in P_{k-1}. In fact $s_{k-1}(\mathbf{0}) = S_{k-1} < S_k = s_k(\mathbf{0})$ and

$$\{\ell_i(\mathbf{0}) \mid i = 1, \cdots, m\} \cap (S_{k-1}, S_k) = \emptyset.$$

Lemma 9.7. *If $u \in A_k$ then $\ell_{k,j}(u) = S_k$.*

Proof. We may assume $k < K$. Hence $\mathbf{0} \in \operatorname{Int} P_k$. We regard $u \in A_k = T_{\mathbf{0}} A_k$. By (9.9), we have

$$s_k(\varepsilon u) = \inf\{\ell_{k,j}(\epsilon u) \mid j = 1, \cdots, a(k)\}.$$

Since $s_k(\varepsilon u) = S_k$ for $\varepsilon u \in P_k$ it follows that $\ell_{k,j}(u) = S_k$. □

Lemma 9.7 implies that the linear part $d\ell_{k,j}$ of $\ell_{k,j}$ is an element of $A_k^\perp \subset \mathfrak{t} = N_{\mathbb{R}}$. In fact if $\ell_{k,j} = \ell_i$, we have $d\ell_{k,j} = v_i$ from the definition of ℓ_i, $\ell_i(u) = \langle u, v_i \rangle - \lambda_i$ given in Theorem 2.13.

Lemma 9.8. *For any $v \in A_k^\perp$, there exist nonnegative real numbers $c_j \geq 0$, $j = 1, \cdots, a(k)$ such that*

$$v - \sum_{j=1}^{a(k)} c_j d\ell_{k,j} \in A_{k-1}^\perp.$$

Proof. Suppose to the contrary that

$$\left\{ v - \sum_{j=1}^{a(k)} c_j d\ell_{k,j} \,\middle|\, c_j \geq 0,\ j = 1, \cdots, a(k) \right\} \cap A_{k-1}^\perp = \emptyset.$$

Then we can find $u \in A_{k-1} \setminus A_k$ such that

$$d\ell_{k,j}(u) \geq 0 \tag{9.10}$$

for all $j = 1, \cdots, a(k)$.

Since $\varepsilon u \in A_{k-1} \setminus A_k$ it follows that

$$s_k(\varepsilon u) < S_k$$

for a sufficiently small ε. On the other hand, (9.10) implies $d\ell_{k,j}(\varepsilon u) \geq 0$ for all $\varepsilon > 0$ and so $\ell_{k,j}(\varepsilon u) \geq \ell_{k,j}(\mathbf{0}) = S_k$. Therefore by definition of s_k in Proposition 9.1 we have

$$\begin{aligned} s_k(\varepsilon u) &\geq \inf\{\ell_{k,j}(\varepsilon u) \mid j = 1, \cdots, a(k)\} \\ &\geq \inf\{\ell_{k,j}(\mathbf{0}) \mid j = 1, \cdots, a(k)\} = S_k. \end{aligned}$$

This is a contradiction. □

Applying Lemma 9.8 inductively downwards starting from $\ell = k$ ending at $\ell = 1$, we immediately obtain the following

Corollary 9.9. *For any $v \in A_k^\perp$, there exist $c_{l,j} \geq 0$ for $l = 1, \cdots, k$, $j = 1, \cdots, a(l)$ such that*

$$v = \sum_{l=1}^{k} \sum_{j=1}^{a(l)} c_{l,j} d\ell_{l,j}.$$

We denote

$$\mathfrak{I} = \{\ell_i \mid i = 1, \cdots, m\} \setminus \bigcup_{k=1}^{K} I_k. \tag{9.11}$$

It is easy to see that

$$\ell \in \mathfrak{I} \Rightarrow \ell(\mathbf{0}) > S_K. \tag{9.12}$$

Now we go back to the situation of (4.7). We use the notation of (4.7). In this case, for each $k = 1, \cdots, K$, we also associate, in Definition 9.10, a set $\mathfrak{I}_k$ consisting of pairs (ℓ, ρ) with an affine map $\ell : M_{\mathbb{R}} \to \mathbb{R}$ and $\rho \in \mathbb{R}_+$.

Definition 9.10. We say that a pair $(\ell, \rho) = (\ell'_j, \rho_j)$ is an element of $\mathfrak{I}_k$ if the following holds :

(1) If $e^i_j \neq 0$ then $\ell_i \in \bigcup_{l=1}^{k} I_l$. (Note $\ell'_j = \sum_i e^i_j \ell_i$.)
(2) (1) does not hold for some i, j if we replace k by $k-1$.

A pair $(\ell, \rho) = (\ell'_j, \rho_j)$ as in (4.7) is, by definition, an element of $\mathfrak{I}_{K+1}$ if it is not contained in any of $\mathfrak{I}_k$, $k = 1, \cdots, K$.

Lemma 9.11. (1) *If $(\ell, \rho) \in \mathfrak{I}_k$ then $d\ell \in A_k^\perp$.*
(2) *If $(\ell, \rho) \in \mathfrak{I}_k$ then $\ell(\mathbf{0}) + \rho > S_k$.*
(3) *If $(\ell, \rho) \in \mathfrak{I}_{K+1}$ then $\ell(\mathbf{0}) + \rho > S_K$.*

Proof. (1) follows from Definition 9.10 (1) and Lemma 9.7.

If $(\ell, \rho) = (\ell'_j, \rho_j) \in \mathfrak{I}_k$ then there exists $e^i_j \neq 0$, $\ell_i = \ell_{k,j'}$. Then

$$\ell(\mathbf{0}) + \rho \geq e^i_j \ell_i(\mathbf{0}) + \rho_j > \ell_i(\mathbf{0}) = S_k.$$

(2) follows. The proof of (3) is the same. □

Lemma 9.12. *The vector space A_k is defined over $\mathbb{Q}$.*

Proof. A_k is defined by equalities of the type $\ell_i = S_k$ on A_{k-1}. Since the linear part of ℓ_i has integer coefficients, the lemma follows by induction on k. □

We put $d(k) = \dim A_{k-1} - \dim A_k = \dim A_k^\perp - \dim A_{k-1}^\perp$. We choose $\mathbf{e}^*_{i,j} \in Hom(M_{\mathbb{Q}}, \mathbb{Q}) \cong N_{\mathbb{Q}}$ $(i = 1, \cdots, K,\ j = 1, \cdots, d(k))$ such that the following condition holds. Here $M_{\mathbb{Q}} = M \otimes \mathbb{Q}$ and $N_{\mathbb{Q}} = N \otimes \mathbb{Q}$

Condition 9.13. (1) $\mathbf{e}^*_{1,1}, \cdots, \mathbf{e}^*_{k,d(k)}$ is a $\mathbb{Q}$ basis of $A_k^\perp \cap N_{\mathbb{Q}}$.
(2) $d\ell_{k,j} = \sum_{k',j'} v_{(k,j),(k',j')} \mathbf{e}^*_{k',j'}$ with $v_{(k,j),(k',j')} \in \mathbb{Z}$.
(3) If $(\ell, \rho) \in \mathfrak{I}_k$ or $\ell \in \mathfrak{I}$, then $d\ell = \sum_{k',j'} v_{\ell,(k',j')} \mathbf{e}^*_{k',j'}$ with $v_{\ell,(k',j')} \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Note $d(k) = 0$ if $A_k = A_{k-1}$.

We identify $\mathbb{R}^n$ with $H^1(L(u); \mathbb{R}^n)$ in the same way as Lemma 4.4 and let $x_{k,j} \in Hom(H^1(L(u); \mathbb{R}), \mathbb{R})$ be the element corresponding to $\mathbf{e}^*_{k,j}$ by this identification. In other words, if

$$\mathbf{e}^*_{k,j} = \sum_i a_{(k,j);i} \mathbf{e}^*_i,$$

where $\mathbf{e}_i^*$ is as in Lemma 4.4, then we have

$$x_{k,j} = \sum_i a_{(k,j);i} x_i.$$

We put $y_{k,j} = e^{x_{k,j}}$. We define

$$Y(k,j) = \prod_{k'=1}^{K} \prod_{j'=1}^{d(k')} y_{k',j'}^{v_{(k,j),(k',j')}}. \tag{9.13}$$

And for $(\ell, \rho) \in \mathfrak{I}_k$ or $\ell \in \mathfrak{I}$, we define

$$Y(\ell) = \prod_{k=1}^{K} \prod_{j=1}^{d(k)} y_{k,j}^{v_{\ell,(k,j)}}. \tag{9.14}$$

By Theorem 4.6 there exists $c_{(\ell,\rho)} \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{PO}^{\mathbf{0}} = &\sum_{k=1}^{K} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{a(k)} Y(k,j) \right) T^{S_k} + \sum_{\ell \in \mathfrak{I}} Y(\ell) T^{\ell(\mathbf{0})} \\ &+ \sum_{k=1}^{K+1} \sum_{(\ell,\rho) \in \mathfrak{I}_k} c_{(\ell,\rho)} Y(\ell) T^{\ell(\mathbf{0})+\rho} \end{aligned} \tag{9.15}$$

where $\mathfrak{PO}^{\mathbf{0}}$ is $\mathfrak{PO}^u$ with $u = \mathbf{0}$.

Lemma 9.14. (1) *If $k' < k$ then*

$$\frac{\partial Y(k',j')}{\partial y_{k,j}} = 0. \tag{9.16}$$

(2) *If $(\ell,\rho) \in \mathfrak{I}_{k'}$, $k' < k$ then*

$$\frac{\partial Y(\ell)}{\partial y_{k,j}} = 0. \tag{9.17}$$

(3) *If $(\ell,\rho) \in \mathfrak{I}_k$ then $\ell(\mathbf{0}) + \rho > S_k$.*
(4) *If $(\ell,\rho) \in \mathfrak{I}_{K+1}$ then $\ell(\mathbf{0}) + \rho > S_K$.*
(5) *If $\ell \in \mathfrak{I}$ then $\ell(\mathbf{0}) > S_K$.*

Proof. Since $d\ell_{k',j'} \in A_{k'}^{\perp}$ by Lemma 9.7 it follows that $v_{(k',j'),(k,j)} = 0$ for $k > k'$. (1) follows. (2) follows from Lemma 9.11 (1) in the same way. (3) follows from Lemma 9.11 (2). (4) follows from Lemma 9.11 (3). (5) follows from (9.12). □

Now equation (4.10) becomes

$$0 = \frac{\partial \mathfrak{PO}^{\mathbf{0}}}{\partial y_{k,j}}.$$

We calculate this equation using Lemma 9.14 to find that it is equivalent to :

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = &\sum_{j'=1}^{a(k)} \frac{\partial Y(k,j')}{\partial y_{k,j}} + \sum_{k'>k} \sum_{j'=1}^{a(k')} \frac{\partial Y(k',j')}{\partial y_{k,j}} T^{S_{k'}-S_k} \\ &+ \sum_{k'=k}^{K+1} \sum_{(\ell,\rho) \in \mathfrak{I}_{k'}} c_{(\ell,\rho)} \frac{\partial Y(\ell)}{\partial y_{k,j}} T^{\ell(\mathbf{0})+\rho-S_k} + \sum_{\ell \in \mathfrak{I}} \frac{\partial Y(\ell)}{\partial y_{k,j}} T^{\ell(\mathbf{0})-S_k}. \end{aligned} \tag{9.18}$$

Note the exponents of T in the second, third, and fourth terms of (9.18) are all strictly positive. So after putting $T = 0$ we have

$$0 = \sum_{j'=1}^{a(k)} \frac{\partial Y(k,j')}{\partial y_{k,j}}. \tag{9.19}$$

Note that the equation (9.19) does not involve T but becomes a numerical equation. We call (9.19) the *leading term equation*.

Lemma 9.15. *There exist positive real numbers $\mathfrak{y}_{k,j;0}$, $k = 1, \cdots, K$, $j = 1, \cdots, d(k)$, solving the leading term equations for $k = 1, \cdots, K$.*

Proof. We remark the leading term equation for k, j contain the monomials involving only $y_{k',j}$ for $k' \leq k$. We first solve the leading term equation for $k = 1$. Denote

$$f_1(x_{1,1}, \cdots, x_{1,d(1)}) = \sum_{j=1}^{a(1)} Y(1,j).$$

It follows from Corollary 9.9 that for any $(x_{1,1}, \cdots, x_{1,d(1)}) \neq 0$, there exists j such that

$$d\ell_{1,j}(x_{1,1}, \cdots, x_{1,d(1)}) > 0.$$

Therefore, we have

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} f_1(tx_{1,1}, \cdots, tx_{1,d(1)}) \geq \lim_{t\to\infty} C\exp(td\ell_{1,j}(x_{1,1}, \cdots, x_{1,d(1)})) = +\infty.$$

Hence $f_1(x_{1,1}, \cdots, x_{1,d(1)})$ attains its minimum at some point of $\mathbb{R}^{d(1)}$. Taking its exponential, We obtain $\mathfrak{y}_{1,j;0} \in \mathbb{R}_+$.

Suppose we have already found $\mathfrak{y}_{k',j;0}$ for $k' < k$. Then we put

$$F_k(x_{1,1}, \cdots, x_{k,1}, \cdots, x_{k,d(k)}) = \sum_{j=1}^{a(k)} Y(k,j)$$

and

$$f_k(x_{k,1}, \cdots, x_{k,d(k)}) = F_k(\mathfrak{x}_{1,1;0}, \cdots, \mathfrak{x}_{k-1,d(k-1);0}, x_{k,1}, \cdots, x_{k,d(k)})$$

where $\mathfrak{x}_{k',j;0} = \log \mathfrak{y}_{k',j;0}$. Again using Corollary 9.9, we find

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} f_k(tx_{k,1}, \cdots, tx_{k,d(k)}) = +\infty.$$

for any $(x_{k,1}, \cdots, x_{k,d(k)}) \neq 0$. Hence $f_k(x_{k,1}, \cdots, x_{k,d(k)})$ attains a minimum and we obtain $\mathfrak{y}_{k,j;0}$. Lemma 9.15 now follows by induction. □

We next find the solution of our equation (4.11) or (4.12). We take a sufficiently large $\mathcal{N}$ and put

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{PO}^{\mathbf{0}}_{k,\mathcal{N}} = &\sum_{j=1}^{a(k)} Y(k,j) + \sum_{k'>k} \sum_{j'=1}^{a(k')} \frac{\partial Y(k',j')}{\partial y_{k,j}} T^{S_{k'}-S_k} \\ &+ \sum_{\ell\in\mathfrak{I},\ \ell(\mathbf{0})\leq\mathcal{N}} Y(\ell) T^{\ell(\mathbf{0})-S_k} \\ &+ \sum_{k'=k+1}^{K+1} \sum_{(\ell,\rho)\in\mathfrak{I}_{k'},\ell(\mathbf{0})+\rho\leq\mathcal{N}} c_{(\ell,\rho)} Y(\ell) T^{\ell(\mathbf{0})+\rho-S_k}.\end{aligned} \tag{9.20}$$

We remark that (4.11) is equivalent to

$$\frac{\partial \mathfrak{PO}^{\mathbf{0}}_{k,\mathcal{N}}}{\partial y_{k,j}}(\mathfrak{y}_1, \cdots, \mathfrak{y}_n) \equiv 0 \mod T^{\mathcal{N}-S_k} \qquad k = 1, \cdots, K,\ j = 1, \cdots, a(k). \tag{9.21}$$

We also put

$$\overline{\mathfrak{PO}}^{\mathbf{0}}_k = \sum_{j=1}^{a(k)} Y(k,j).$$

It satisfies

$$\overline{\mathfrak{PO}}^{\mathbf{0}}_k \equiv \mathfrak{PO}^{\mathbf{0}}_{k,\mathcal{N}} \mod \Lambda_+. \tag{9.22}$$

For given positive numbers $R(1), \cdots, R(K)$ we define the discs

$$D(R(k)) = \{(x_{k,1} \cdots, x_{k,d(k)}) \mid x_{k,1}^2 + \cdots + x_{k,d(k)}^2 \leq R(k)\} \subset \mathbb{R}^{d(k)}$$

and the poly-discs

$$\begin{aligned} D(R(\cdot)) &= \prod_{k=1}^{K} D(R(k)) \\ &= \{(x_{1,1} \cdots, x_{K,d(K)}) \mid x_{k,1}^2 + \cdots + x_{k,d(k)}^2 \leq R(k),\ k = 1, \cdots, K\}. \end{aligned}$$

We factorize

$$\mathbb{R}^n = \prod_{k=1}^{K} \mathbb{R}^{d(k)}.$$

Then we consider the Jacobian of $\overline{\mathfrak{PO}}^{\mathbf{0}}_k$

$$\nabla \overline{\mathfrak{PO}}^{\mathbf{0}}_k : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^{d(k)}$$

i.e., the map

$$(\mathfrak{x}_{1,1}, \cdots, \mathfrak{x}_{K,d(K)}) \mapsto \left(\frac{\partial \overline{\mathfrak{PO}}^{\mathbf{0}}_k}{\partial x_{k,j}}(\mathfrak{x}_{1,1}, \cdots, \mathfrak{x}_{K,d(K)}) \right)_{j=1,\cdots,d(k)}. \tag{9.23}$$

We remark that $\nabla \overline{\mathfrak{PO}}^{\mathbf{0}}_k$ depends only on $\mathbb{R}^{d(1)} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{R}^{d(k)}$ components.

Combining all $\nabla \overline{\mathfrak{PO}}^{\mathbf{0}}_k$, $k = 1, \cdots, K$ (9.23) induces a map

$$\nabla \overline{\mathfrak{PO}}^{\mathbf{0}} : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$$

defined by

$$\nabla \overline{\mathfrak{PO}}^{\mathbf{0}} = (\nabla \overline{\mathfrak{PO}}^{\mathbf{0}}_1, \cdots, \nabla \overline{\mathfrak{PO}}^{\mathbf{0}}_K).$$

The next lemma is closely related to Lemma 9.15.

Lemma 9.16. *We may choose the positive numbers $R(k)$ for $k = 1, \cdots, K$ such that the following holds :*

1. $\nabla \overline{\mathfrak{PO}}^{\mathbf{0}}$ *is nonzero on* $\partial(D(R(\cdot)))$.
2. *The map* $: \partial(D(R(\cdot))) \to S^{n-1}$

$$\mathfrak{x} \mapsto \frac{\nabla \overline{\mathfrak{PO}}^{\mathbf{0}}}{\|\nabla \overline{\mathfrak{PO}}^{\mathbf{0}}\|}$$

has degree 1.

Proof. We first prove the following sublemma by an upward induction on k_0.

Sublemma 9.17. *There exist $R(k)$'s for $1 \leq k \leq K$ such that for any given $1 \leq k_0 \leq K$ we have*

$$\sum_{j=1}^{d(k_0)} x_{k_0,j} \frac{\partial \overline{\mathfrak{PO}}^{\mathbf{0}}_{k_0}}{\partial x_{k_0,j}}(x_{1,1}, \cdots, x_{k_0,d(k_0)}) > 0 \tag{9.24}$$

if $(x_{k,1}, \cdots, x_{k,d(k)}) \in D(R(k))$ for all $1 \leq k \leq k_0 - 1$ and $(x_{k_0,1}, \cdots, x_{k_0,d(k_0)}) \in \partial D(R(k_0))$.

Proof. In case $k_0 = 1$ the existence of $R(1)$ satisfying (9.24) is a consequence of Corollary 9.9. We assume that the sublemma is proved for $1, \cdots, k_0 - 1$.

For each fixed $\mathbf{x} = (x_{1,1}, \cdots, x_{k_0-1,d(k_0-1)})$ we can find $R(k_0)_{\mathbf{x}}$ such that (9.24) holds for $(x_{k_0,1}, \cdots, x_{k_0,d(k_0)}) \in \mathbb{R}^{d(k_0)} \setminus D(R(k_0)_{\mathbf{x}}/2)$. This is also a consequence of Corollary 9.9.

We take supremum of $R(k_0)_{\mathbf{x}}$ over the compact set $\mathbf{x} \in \prod_{k=1}^{k_0-1} D(R(k))$ and obtain $R(k_0)$. The proof of Sublemma 9.17 is complete. □

It is easy to see that Lemma 9.16 follows from Sublemma 9.17. □

We now use our assumption that the vertices of P lies in $M_{\mathbb{Q}} = \mathbb{Q}^n$ and that $\rho_j \in \mathbb{Q}$. Replacing T by $T^{1/C}$ if necessary, we may assume that all the exponents of $y_{k,j}$ and T appearing in (9.20) are integers. Then

$$\mathfrak{PO}^{\mathbf{0}}_{k,\mathcal{N}} = \mathfrak{PO}^{\mathbf{0}}_{k,\mathcal{N}}(y_{1,1}, \cdots, y_{K,d(K)}; T)$$

are polynomials of $y_{k,j}$, $y_{k,j}^{-1}$ and T. Define the set $\mathfrak{X}$ by the set consisting of

$$(\mathfrak{y}_{1,1}, \cdots, \mathfrak{y}_{K,d(K)}; q) \in (\mathbb{R}_+)^n \times \mathbb{R}$$

that satisfy

$$\frac{\partial \mathfrak{PO}^{\mathbf{0}}_{k,\mathcal{N}}}{\partial y_{k,j}}(\mathfrak{y}_{1,1}, \cdots, \mathfrak{y}_{K,d(K)}; q) = 0, \tag{9.25}$$

for $k = 1, \cdots, K$, $j = 1, \cdots, d(k)$. Clearly $\mathfrak{X}$ is a real affine algebraic variety. (Note the equation for y_i are polynomials. So we need to regard y_i (not x_i) as variables to regard $\mathfrak{X}$ as a real affine algebraic variety.)

Consider the projection

$$\pi : \mathfrak{X} \to \mathbb{R}, \quad \pi(\mathfrak{y}_{1,1}, \cdots, \mathfrak{y}_{K,d(K)}; q) = q$$

which is a morphism of algebraic varieties.

Lemma 9.18. *There exists a sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$ such that if $|q| < \epsilon$ then*

$$\pi^{-1}(q) \cap \{(e^{x_1}, \cdots, e^{x_n}) \mid (x_1, \cdots, x_n) \in D(R(\cdot))\} \neq \emptyset.$$

Proof. We consider the real analytic q-family of polynomials

$$\mathfrak{PO}^{\mathbf{0}}_{k,\mathcal{N},q}(y_{1,1}, \cdots, y_{K,d(K)}) = \mathfrak{PO}^{\mathbf{0}}_{k,\mathcal{N}}(y_{1,1}, \cdots, y_{K,d(K)}; q).$$

Then

$$\mathfrak{PO}^{\mathbf{0}}_{k,\mathcal{N},0} = \overline{\mathfrak{PO}}^{\mathbf{0}}_{k,\mathcal{N}}. \tag{9.26}$$

Replacing $\overline{\mathfrak{PO}}^{\mathbf{0}}_{k,\mathcal{N}}$ by $\mathfrak{PO}^{\mathbf{0}}_{k,\mathcal{N},q}$, we can repeat construction of the map

$$\nabla \mathfrak{PO}^{\mathbf{0}}_{\mathcal{N},q} : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$$

for each fixed $q \in \mathbb{R}$ in the same way as we defined $\nabla \overline{\mathfrak{PO}}^{\mathbf{0}}$. Then the conclusion of Lemma 9.16 holds for $\nabla \mathfrak{PO}^{\mathbf{0}}_{\mathcal{N},q}$ if $|q|$ is sufficiently small. (This is a consequence of

Lemma 9.16 and (9.26).) Lemma 9.18 follows from elementary algebraic topology. □

Lemma 9.18 implies that we can find

$$\mathfrak{y}_0 = (\mathfrak{y}_{1,1;0}, \cdots, \mathfrak{y}_{K,d(K);0}) \in \mathbb{R}^n_+$$

and a sequence

$$(\mathfrak{y}_h, q_h) = (\mathfrak{y}^h_{1,1;0}, \cdots, \mathfrak{y}^h_{K,d(K);0}; q_h) \in \mathfrak{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$$

$h = 1, 2, \cdots$ such that $q_h > 0$ and $\lim_{h\to\infty}(\mathfrak{y}_h, q_h) = (\mathfrak{y}_0, 0)$. Therefore by the curve selection lemma (Lemma 3.1 [Mi]) there exists a real analytic map

$$\gamma : [0, \epsilon) \to \mathfrak{X}$$

such that $\gamma(0) = (\mathfrak{y}_0, 0)$ and $\pi(\gamma(t)) > 0$ for $t > 0$. We reparameterize $\gamma(t)$, so that its q-component is $t^{a/b}$, where a and b are relatively prime integers. We put $T = t^{a/b}$ i.e., $t = T^{b/a}$ and denote the $y_{k,j}$-components of $\gamma(t)$ by

$$\mathfrak{y}_{k,j} = \mathfrak{y}_{k,j;0} + \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \mathfrak{y}_{k,j;\ell} T^{b\ell/a}.$$

Since $\gamma(t) \in \mathfrak{X}$, the element $(\mathfrak{y}_{k,j})_{k,j} \in (\Lambda_0^{\mathbb{R}} \setminus \Lambda_+^{\mathbb{R}})^n$ is the required solution of (4.11).

Since $\mathfrak{PO}_0$ contains only a finite number of summands, we can take $\mathfrak{PO}_{0,\mathcal{N}} = \mathfrak{PO}_0$. Therefore we can find a solution of (4.12) for $\mathfrak{PO}_0$.

The proof of Proposition 4.7 is now complete. □

10. Elimination of higher order term in nondegenerate cases

In this section, we prove a rather technical (but useful) result, which shows that solutions of the leading term equation (9.19) correspond to actual critical points under certain non-degeneracy condition. For this purpose, we slightly modify the argument of the last part of section 9. This result will be useful to determine $u \in \operatorname{Int} P$ such that $HF((L(u);\mathfrak{x}),(L(u);\mathfrak{x});\Lambda_0) \neq 0$ for some $\mathfrak{x}$ in non-Fano cases. (In other words we study the image of $\mathfrak{M}(\mathfrak{Lag}(X)) \to \operatorname{Int} P$ by the map $(\mathfrak{x}, u) \mapsto u$.) In fact it shows that we can use $\mathfrak{PO}_0$ in place of $\mathfrak{PO}$ in most practical cases. We remark that we explicitly calculate $\mathfrak{PO}_0$ but do not know the precise form of $\mathfrak{PO}$ in non-Fano cases.

In order to state the result in a general form, we prepare some notations. Let $u_0 \in \operatorname{Int} P$. (In section 9, u_0 is determined as the unique element of P_K defined in Proposition 9.1. The present situation is more general.)

We define positive real numbers $S_1 < S_2 < \cdots$ by

$$\{\ell_i(u_0) \mid i = 1, \cdots, m\} = \{S_1, S_2, \cdots, S_{m'}\} \tag{10.1}$$

and the sets

$$I_k = \{\ell_i \mid \ell_i(u_0) = S_k\}, \tag{10.2}$$

for $k = 1, \cdots$. We renumber each of I_k so that

$$\{\ell_{k,j} \mid j = 1, \cdots, a(k)\} = I_k. \tag{10.3}$$

Definition 10.1. Let $A_l^{\perp}$ be the linear subspace of $N_{\mathbb{R}}$ spanned by $d\ell_{k,j}$ $k \leq l$, $j \leq a(k)$. We define K to be the smallest number such that $A_K^{\perp} = N_{\mathbb{R}}$.

Note our notations here are consistent with one in section 9 in case $\{u_0\} = P_K$. We define $\mathfrak{I}$ and $\mathfrak{I}_k$ by (9.11) and Definition 9.10. Then Lemma 9.11 and (9.12) hold. We choose $\mathbf{e}^*_{i,j} \in Hom(M_{\mathbb{Q}}, \mathbb{Q})$ such that Condition 9.13 is satisfied. (Note $A_l^{\perp}$ is defined over $\mathbb{Q}$.) $x_{i,j}$ and $y_{i,j}$ then are defined in the same way as section 9. We define $Y(k,j)$ by (9.13) and $Y(\ell)$ by (9.14). Then (9.15) and Lemma 9.14 hold.

We remark that Corollary 9.9 does *not* hold in general in the current situation. In fact we can write

$$v = \sum_{l=1}^{k} \sum_{j=1}^{a(l)} c_{l,j} d\ell_{l,j}$$

under the assumption of Corollary 9.9 but we may not be able to ensure $c_{l,j} \geq 0$.

Definition 10.2. (1) We call

$$0 = \sum_{j'=1}^{a(k)} \frac{\partial Y(k,j')}{\partial y_{k,j}}, \quad k = 1, \cdots, K, \ j = 1, \cdots, d(k)$$

the *leading term equation* at u_0. We regard it as a polynomial equation for $\mathfrak{y}_{k,j} \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$, $k = 1, \cdots, K$, $j = 1, \cdots, d(k)$.

(2) A solution $\mathfrak{y}^0 = (\mathfrak{y}_{k,j;0})_{k=1,\cdots,K,\, j=1,\cdots,d(k)}$ of leading term equation is said to be *weakly nondegenerate* if it is isolated in the set of solutions.

(3) A solution $\mathfrak{y}^0 = (\mathfrak{y}_{k,j;0})_{k=1,\cdots,K,\, j=1,\cdots,d(k)}$ of leading term equation is said to be *strongly nondegenerate* if the matrices

$$\left(\sum_{j'=1}^{a(k)} \frac{\partial^2 Y(k,j')}{\partial y_{k,j_1} \partial y_{k,j_2}} \right)_{j_1, j_2 = 1, \cdots, a(k)}$$

are invertible for $k = 1, \cdots, K$, at $\mathfrak{y}^0$.

(4) We define the multiplicity of leading term equation in the standard way of algebraic geometry, in the weakly nondegenerate case.

Example 10.3. In Example 9.6, the equation (9.6) is the leading term equation.

Let $\mathfrak{PO}^{u_0}_*$ be either $\mathfrak{PO}^{u_0}_0$ or $\mathfrak{PO}^{u_0}$.

Theorem 10.4. *For any strongly nondegenerate solution $\mathfrak{y}^0 = (\mathfrak{y}_{k,j;0})$ of leading term equation, there exists a solution $\mathfrak{y} = (\mathfrak{y}_{k,j}) \in (\Lambda_0^{\mathbb{C}} \setminus \Lambda_+^{\mathbb{C}})^n$ of*

$$\frac{\partial \mathfrak{PO}^{u_0}_*}{\partial y_{k,j}}(\mathfrak{y}) = 0 \tag{10.4}$$

such that $\mathfrak{y}_{k,j} \equiv \mathfrak{y}_{k,j;0} \mod \Lambda_+^{\mathbb{C}}$.

If all the vertices of P and u_0 are rational, the same conclusion holds for weakly nondegenerate $\mathfrak{y}^0$.

We prove the following at the end of section 13.

Lemma 10.5. *We assume $[\omega] \in H^2(X;\mathbb{Q})$ and choose the moment polytope P such that its vertices are all rational. Let $u_0 \in \mathrm{Int} P$ such that $\mathfrak{PO}^{u_0}_0$ has weakly nondegenerate critical point in $(\Lambda_0 \setminus \Lambda_+)^n$. Then u_0 is rational.*

The following corollary is an immediate consequence of Theorem 10.4 and Lemma 10.5.

Corollary 10.6. *Let* $(\mathfrak{x}, u) \in \mathfrak{M}_0(\mathfrak{Lag}(X))$ *and* $u \in \operatorname{Int} P$. *Assume one of the following conditions :*

(1) *The corresponding solution of the leading term equation is strongly nondegenerate.*
(2) $[\omega] \in H^2(X;\mathbb{R})$ *is rational and the corresponding solution of leading term equation is weakly nondegenerate.*

Then there exists $\mathfrak{x}'$ *such that* $(\mathfrak{x}', u) \in \mathfrak{M}(\mathfrak{Lag}(X))$ *and* $\mathfrak{x}' \equiv \mathfrak{x} \mod \Lambda_+^{\mathbb{C}}$.

Remark 10.7.
(1) Using Proposition 10.8 below, we can also apply Theorem 10.4 and Corollary 10.6 to study non-displacement of Lagrangian fibers for the weakly nondegenerate case, without assuming rationality. See the last step of the proof of Theorem 1.5 given at the end of section 13.
(2) The conclusion of Theorem 10.4 does not hold in general without weakly nondegenerate assumption. We give an example (Example 10.17) where both the assumption of weak nondegeneracy and the conclusion of Theorem 10.4 fail to hold.
(3) In this section we work with $\Lambda^{\mathbb{C}}$ coefficients, while in the last section we work with $\Lambda^{\mathbb{R}}$ coefficients. We also remark that in the last section, we did *not* assume the weak nondegeneracy condition.
(4) If we define the multiplicity of the element of $\mathfrak{M}_0(\mathfrak{Lag}(X))$ as the dimension of the Jacobian ring $Jac(\mathfrak{PO}_0; \mathfrak{x}, u_0)$ in Definition 7.9 (namely as the Milnor number) then the sum of the multiplicities of the solutions of (10.4) converging to $\mathfrak{y}^0$ as $T \to 0$, is equal to the multiplicity of $\mathfrak{y}^0$.
(5) In the strongly nondegenerate case, the solution of (10.4) with the given leading term is unique.

Proposition 10.8. *Let* (X, ω) *be a compact toric manifold with moment polytope* P *and* $u_0 \in \operatorname{Int} P$. *Then there exist* (X, ω^h) *with moment polytope* P^h *and* $u_0^h \in \operatorname{Int} P^h$ *such that the following holds:*

(1) $\lim_{h\to\infty} \omega^h = \omega$. $\lim_{h\to\infty} u_0^h = u_0$.
(2) *The vertices of* P^h *and* u_0^h *are rational.*
(3) *The leading term equation at* u_0^h *is the same as the leading term equation at* u_0.

We prove Proposition 10.8 at the end of section 13.

We first derive Theorem 1.14 and Lemma 8.3 from Theorem 10.4 before proving Theorem 10.4.

Proof of Theorem 1.14. We start with $\mathbb{C}P^2$ and blow up a T^2 fixed point to obtain $\mathbb{C}P^2\#(-\mathbb{C}P^2)$. We take a Kähler form so that the volume of the exceptional $\mathbb{C}P^1$ is $2\pi\epsilon_1$ which is small. We next blow up again at one of the fixed points so that the volume of the exceptional $\mathbb{C}P^1$ is ϵ_2 and is small compared with ϵ_1. We continue k times to obtain $X(k)$, whose Kähler structure depends on $\epsilon_1, \cdots, \epsilon_k$. Note $X(k)$ is non-Fano for $k > 3$.

Let $P(k)$ be the moment polytope of $X(k)$ and $\mathfrak{PO}_{0,k}$ be the leading order potential function of $X(k)$. We remark that $P(k)$ is obtained by cutting out a vertex of $P(k-1)$. (See [Ful].)

Lemma 10.9. *We may choose* ϵ_i $(i = 1, \cdots, k)$ *so that the following holds for* $l \leq k$.

(1) *The number of balanced fibers of* $P(l)$ *is* $l+1$. *We write them as* $L(u^{(l,i)})$ $i = 0, \cdots, l$.
(2) $u^{(l-1,i)} = u^{(l,i)}$ *for* $i \leq l-1$. $u^{(l,0)} = (1/3, 1/3)$.
(3) $u^{(l,l)}$ *is in an* $o(\epsilon_l)$ *neighborhood of the vertices corresponding to the point we blow up.*
(4) *The leading term equation of* $\mathfrak{PO}_{0,l-1}$ *at* $u^{(l-1,i)}$ *is the same as the leading term equation of* $\mathfrak{PO}_{0,l}$ *at* $u^{(l,i)}$ *for* $i \leq l-1$.
(5) *The leading term equations are all strongly nondegenerate.*

Proof. The proof is by induction on k. There is nothing to show for $k = 0$. Suppose that we have proved Lemma 10.9 up to $k-1$. Let w be the vertex of the polytope we cut out which corresponds to the blow up of $X(k-1)$. Let ℓ_i, $\ell_{i'}$ be the affine functions associated to the two edges containing w. It is easy to see that

$$P(k) = \{u \in P(k-1) \mid \ell_i(u) + \ell_{i'}(u) \geq \epsilon_k\}.$$

We also have :

$$\mathfrak{PO}_{0,k} = \mathfrak{PO}_{0,k-1} + T^{\ell_i(u)+\ell_{i'}(u)-\epsilon_k} y_1^{v_{i,1}+v_{i',1}} y_2^{v_{i,2}+v_{i',2}}.$$

Therefore if we choose ϵ_k sufficiently small, the leading term equation at $u^{(k-1,i)}$ does not change.

We take $u^{(k,k)}$ such that

$$\ell_i(u^{(k,k)}) = \ell_{i'}(u^{(k,k)}) = \epsilon_k.$$

It is easy to see that there exists such $u^{(k,k)}$ uniquely if ϵ_k is sufficiently small. We put

$$y_1' = y_1^{v_{i,1}} y_2^{v_{i,2}}, \quad y_2' = y_1^{v_{i',1}} y_2^{v_{i',2}}.$$

(We remark that v_i and $v_{i'}$ are $\mathbb{Z}$ basis of $\mathbb{Z}^2$, since $X(k-1)$ is smooth toric.) Then we have

$$\mathfrak{PO}_{0,k}^{u^{(k,k)}} \equiv (y_1' + y_2' + y_1'y_2')T^{\epsilon_k} \mod T^{\epsilon_k}\Lambda_+.$$

Therefore the leading term equation is

$$1 + y_1' = 1 + y_2' = 0$$

and hence has a unique solution $(-1,-1)$. In particular it is strongly nondegenerate. We can also easily check that there is no other solution of leading term equation. The proof of Lemma 10.9 now follows by Theorem 10.4. □

Theorem 1.14 immediately follows from Lemma 10.9. □

Note that Theorem 1.14 can be generalized to $\mathbb{C}P^n$ by the same proof.

Proof of Lemma 8.3. Let $u_0 = (n(\alpha+1)/4, (1-\alpha)/2)$. We calculate

$$\mathfrak{PO}_0^{u_0} = (y_2 + y_2^{-1})T^{(1-\alpha)/2} + (y_1 + y_1^{-1}y_2^{-1})T^{n(\alpha+1)/4}.$$

The leading equation is

$$1 - y_2^{-2} = 0, \quad 1 - y_1^{-2}y_2^{-1} = 0.$$

Its solution are $(1,1), (-1,1), (\sqrt{-1}, -1), (-\sqrt{-1}, -1)$, all of which are strongly nondegenerate. The lemma them follows from Corollary 10.6. □

We give another example which demonstrates the way how one can use the leading term equation and Theorem 10.4 to locate balanced fibers.

Example 10.10. Let us consider $\mathbb{C}P^n$ with moment polytope $P = \{(u_1, \cdots, u_n) \mid u_i \geq 0, \sum u_i \leq 1\}$. We take $\mathbb{C}P^{n-\ell} \subset \mathbb{C}P^n$ corresponding to $u_1 = \cdots = u_\ell = 0$. ($\ell \geq 2$.) We blow up $\mathbb{C}P^n$ along the center $\mathbb{C}P^{n-\ell}$ and denote the blow-up by X. (The case $\ell = n = 2$ is Example 8.1.) We take $\alpha \in (0,1)$ so that the moment polytope of X is

$$P_\alpha = \left\{ (u_1, \cdots, u_n) \in P \;\middle|\; \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} u_i \geq \alpha \right\}.$$

Below we use $\mathfrak{PO}_0$ in place of the potential function $\mathfrak{PO}$. Since the all the critical points of $\mathfrak{PO}_0$ are weakly nondegenerate, they correspond to the critical points of $\mathfrak{PO}$. (We thank D. McDuff for pointing out that this example is not Fano.) The function $\mathfrak{PO}_0$ is given by

$$\mathfrak{PO}_0 = \sum_{i=1}^{n} T^{u_i} y_i + T^{1-\sum_{i=1}^n u_i} (y_1 \cdots y_n)^{-1} + T^{\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} u_i - \alpha} y_1 \cdots y_\ell.$$

We denote

$$z_i = T^{u_i} y_i, \quad z_0 = T^{1-\sum_{i=1}^n u_i} (y_1 \cdots y_n)^{-1}, \quad z = T^{\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} u_i - \alpha} y_1 \cdots y_\ell.$$

Then the quantum Stanley-Reisner relations are :

$$z_1 \cdots z_n z_0 = T, \;\; z_1 \cdots z_\ell = z T^\alpha.$$

By computing the derivatives $y_i \frac{\partial \mathfrak{PO}_0}{\partial y_i}$, we obtain the linear relations which can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} z_i - z_0 + z &= 0 \quad \text{for } i \leq \ell \\ z_i - z_0 &= 0 \quad \text{for } i > \ell. \end{aligned}$$

Putting $X = z_0 - z$, $Y = z$, we obtain

$$z_i = \begin{cases} X & \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq \ell \\ X + Y & \text{for } i > \ell \text{ or } i = 0. \end{cases}$$

We also have $X^\ell = Y T^\alpha$ and

$$X^{n+1} (X^{\ell-1} T^{-\alpha} + 1)^{n-\ell+1} = T. \tag{10.5}$$

Case 1; $(\ell - 1)\mathfrak{v}_T(X) < \alpha$: In this case, we obtain

$$\mathfrak{v}_T(X) = \frac{1 + \alpha(n - \ell + 1)}{n + 1 + (n - \ell + 1)(\ell - 1)}.$$

The condition $(\ell - 1)\mathfrak{v}_T(X) < \alpha$ then is equivalent to

$$\alpha > \frac{\ell - 1}{n + 1}.$$

And we have

$$\mathfrak{v}_T(X + Y) = \mathfrak{v}_T(Y) = \ell \mathfrak{v}_T(X) - \alpha < \mathfrak{v}_T(X)$$

for $i > \ell$. At the point $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, \cdots, u_n)$ with $u_i = \mathfrak{v}_T(X)$ for $1 \leq i \leq \ell$ and $u_i = \mathfrak{v}_T(X + Y)$ for $i \geq \ell$, we have

$$\mathfrak{PO}_0^{\mathbf{u}} = T^{\mathfrak{v}_T(Y)} (y_{\ell+1} + \cdots + y_n + (y_1 \cdots y_n)^{-1} + y_1 \cdots y_\ell) + T^{\mathfrak{v}_T(X)} (y_1 + \cdots + y_\ell).$$

To obtain the leading term equation, it is useful to make a change of variables from $y_1, \cdots, y_n$ to $y_2, \cdots, y_n, y$ with $y = y_1 \cdots y_\ell$.

In fact, using the notation which we introduced at the beginning of this section, we have

$$S_1 = \mathfrak{v}_T(Y), \quad S_2 = \mathfrak{v}_T(X),$$

and $A_1^\perp$ is the vector space generated by $\partial/\partial u_i$, $(i = \ell+1, \cdots, n)$ and $\partial/\partial u_1 + \cdots + \partial/\partial u_\ell$. We also have $A_2^\perp = \mathbb{R}^n$. Therefore a basis satisfying Condition 9.13 is

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial u_2}, \quad \cdots, \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial u_n}, \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial u_1} + \cdots + \frac{\partial}{\partial u_\ell}.$$

The variables corresponding to this basis is $y_2, \cdots, y_n, y$. In these variables, $\mathfrak{PO}_0^{\mathbf{u}}$ has the form

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{PO}_0^{\mathbf{u}} &= T^{\mathfrak{v}_T(Y)}(y_{\ell+1} + \cdots + y_n + (yy_{\ell+1}\cdots y_n)^{-1} + y) \\ &\quad + T^{\mathfrak{v}_T(X)}(y(y_2\cdots y_\ell)^{-1} + y_2 + \cdots + y_\ell).\end{aligned}$$

Then the leading term equation becomes :

$$\begin{cases} 0 = 1 - y^{-1}(yy_{\ell+1}\cdots y_n)^{-1} & \\ 0 = 1 - y_i^{-1}(yy_{\ell+1}\cdots y_n)^{-1} & \text{for } i > \ell \\ 0 = 1 - y_i^{-1}y(y_2\cdots y_\ell)^{-1} & \text{for } 2 \le i \le \ell. \end{cases}$$

Its solutions are

$$\begin{aligned} y_{\ell+1} = \cdots = y_n = y = \theta, &\qquad \theta^{n-\ell+2} = 1 \\ y_2 = \cdots = y_\ell = \rho, &\qquad \rho^\ell = \theta. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that this leading term equation has $\ell(n-\ell+2)$ solutions, all of which are strongly nondegenerate.

Case 2; $(\ell-1)\mathfrak{v}_T(X) > \alpha$: We have

$$\mathfrak{v}_T(X) = \frac{1}{n+1}.$$

We also have $\mathfrak{v}_T(Y) = \ell\mathfrak{v}_T(X) - \alpha > \mathfrak{v}_T(X)$ and hence

$$\mathfrak{v}_T(X+Y) = \mathfrak{v}_T(X) = \frac{1}{n+1}.$$

The condition $(\ell-1)\mathfrak{v}_T(X) > \alpha$ becomes $\alpha < \frac{\ell-1}{n+1}$. If we consider the point $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, \cdots, u_n)$ with $u_i = \mathfrak{v}_T(X) = \frac{1}{n+1}$ for $i = 1, \cdots n$, $\mathfrak{PO}_0^{\mathbf{u}}$ has the form

$$\mathfrak{PO}_0^{\mathbf{u}} = T^{1/n+1}(y_1 + \cdots + y_n + (y_1\cdots y_n)^{-1}) + T^{\frac{\ell}{n+1}-\alpha}y_1\cdots y_\ell$$

and so the leading term equation is obtained by differentiating

$$y_1 + \cdots + y_n + (y_1\cdots y_n)^{-1}.$$

Its solutions are

$$y_1 = \cdots = y_n = \theta, \qquad \theta^{n+1} = 1.$$

There are $n+1$ solutions all of which are strongly nondegenerate.

Case 3; $(\ell-1)\mathfrak{v}_T(X) = \alpha$:
(Case 3-1; $-X^{\ell-1} \not\equiv T^\alpha \mod T^\alpha\Lambda_+$.) We have $u_i = \mathfrak{v}_T(X) = \mathfrak{v}_T(Y) = 1/(n+1)$ $(i = 1, \cdots, n)$, $\alpha = (\ell-1)/(n+1)$. In this case

$$\mathfrak{PO}_0^{\mathbf{u}} = T^{1/(n+1)}(y_1 + \cdots + y_n + (y_1\cdots y_n)^{-1} + y_1\cdots y_\ell).$$

This formula implies that the symplectic area of all discs with Maslov index 2 are $2\pi/(n+1)$.

The leading term equation is

$$\begin{cases} 1 - \frac{1}{y_i}((y_1 \cdots y_n)^{-1} - y_1 \cdots y_\ell) = 0, & i = 1, \cdots, \ell \\ 1 - \frac{1}{y_i}((y_1 \cdots y_n)^{-1}) = 0, & i = \ell+1, \cdots, n. \end{cases}$$

Its solutions are $y_1 = \cdots = y_\ell = \rho$, $y_{\ell+1} = \cdots = y_n = \theta$ with

$$\rho^\ell(\rho + \rho^\ell)^{n-\ell+1} = 1, \tag{10.6}$$

and $\theta = \rho + \rho^\ell$. It looks rather cumbersome to check whether (10.6) has multiple root. Certainly all the solutions are weakly nondegenerate. The number of solutions counted with multiplicity is $\ell(n - \ell + 2)$.

(Case 3-2; $-X^{\ell-1} \equiv T^\alpha \mod T^\alpha \Lambda_+$.) We have

$$z_0 = X + Y = T^{-\alpha} X(T^\alpha + X^{\ell-1}).$$

We put

$$\mathfrak{v}_T(z_0) = \lambda > \mathfrak{v}_T(X) = \frac{\alpha}{\ell - 1}.$$

Using (10.5) we obtain

$$\lambda = \frac{\ell - 1 - \ell\alpha}{(\ell - 1)(n - \ell + 1)}.$$

The condition $\lambda > \frac{\alpha}{\ell-1}$ becomes $\alpha < \frac{\ell-1}{n+1}$. We have $u_i = \mathfrak{v}_T(X) = \alpha/(\ell-1)$, $i \le \ell$ and $u_i = \mathfrak{v}_T(Y) = \lambda$, $i > \ell$. We have

$$\mathfrak{PO}_0^{\mathfrak{u}} = T^{\mathfrak{v}_T(X)}(y_1 + \cdots + y_\ell + y_1 \cdots y_\ell) + T^{\mathfrak{v}_T(Y)}(y_{\ell+1} + \cdots + y_n + (y_1 \cdots y_n)^{-1}).$$

The first term gives the leading term equation :

$$1 + y_1 \cdots \widehat{y_i} \cdots y_\ell = 0, \qquad i = 1, \cdots, \ell.$$

It solution is $y_1 = \cdots = y_\ell = \rho$ and $\rho^{\ell-1} = -1$. The second term of $\mathfrak{PO}_0^{\mathfrak{u}}$ gives the leading term equation

$$1 - y_i^{-1}\rho^{-\ell}(y_{\ell+1} \cdots y_n)^{-1} = 0, \qquad i = \ell+1, \cdots, n.$$

Its solutions are $y_{\ell+1} = \cdots y_n = \theta$, with

$$\rho^\ell \theta^{n-\ell+1} = 1.$$

Thus the leading term equation has $(\ell - 1)(n + 1 - \ell)$ solutions all of which are strongly nondegenerate.

We remark that $(\ell - 1)(n + 1 - \ell) + (n + 1) = \ell(n - \ell + 2)$. Hence the number of solutions are always $\ell(n - \ell + 2)$ which coincides with the Betti number of X. There are 2 balanced fibers for $\alpha < (\ell - 1)/(n + 1)$ and 1 balanced fiber for $\alpha \ge (\ell - 1)/(n + 1)$.

By the above discussion and Theorem 6.1 (see also Remark 6.14), we can calculate $QH(X; \Lambda^{\mathbb{Q}})$ as follows :

$$QH(X; \Lambda^{\mathbb{Q}}) = \begin{cases} \Lambda^{R_1} & \alpha > (\ell - 1)/(n + 1), \\ \Lambda^{R_2} & \alpha = (\ell - 1)/(n + 1), \\ \Lambda^{R_3} \times \Lambda^{R_4} & \alpha < (\ell - 1)/(n + 1), \end{cases} \tag{10.7}$$

where

$$R_1 = \mathbb{Q}[Z]/(Z^{\ell(n-\ell+2)} - 1),$$
$$R_2 = \mathbb{Q}[Z]/(Z^{\ell}(Z + Z^{\ell})^{n-\ell+1} - 1),$$
$$R_3 = \mathbb{Q}[Z]/(Z^{n+1} - 1),$$
$$R_4 = \mathbb{Q}[Z_1, Z_2]/(Z_1^{\ell-1} + 1, Z_1^{\ell} Z_2^{n-\ell+1} - 1).$$

Here we assume (10.6) has only a simple root in case $\alpha = (\ell - 1)/(n + 1)$. We use the next lemma to show (10.7).

Lemma 10.11. *Let $\mathfrak{x} = \sum \mathfrak{x}_i \mathbf{e}_i$ be a critical point of $\mathfrak{PO}^{\mathbf{u}}_*$. We assume $\mathfrak{y}_{i;0} = e^{\mathfrak{x}_{i;0}}$ (where $\mathfrak{x}_i = \mathfrak{x}_{i;0} \mod \Lambda_+$) is a strongly nondegenerate solution of leading term equation. We also assume that $\mathfrak{y}_{i;0} \in F$ where $F \subset \mathbb{C}$ is a field.*

Then $\mathfrak{y}_i = e^{\mathfrak{x}_i}$ is an element of Λ_0^F.

We prove Lemma 10.11 later this section.

We are now ready to give the proof of Theorem 10.4.

Proof of Theorem 10.4. We first consider the weakly nondegenerate case. Let $\mathfrak{m}$ be the multiplicity of $\mathfrak{y}^0$. We choose δ such that the ball $B_\delta(\mathfrak{y}^0)$ centered at $\mathfrak{y}^0$ and of radius δ does not contain a solution of the leading term equation other than $\mathfrak{y}^0$. For $y \in \partial B_\delta(\mathfrak{y}^0)$ we define

$$\nabla\overline{\mathfrak{PO}}(y) = \left(\sum_{j'=1}^{a(k)} \frac{\partial Y(k, j')}{\partial y_{k,j}}(y) \right)_{k=1,\cdots,K,\, j=1,\cdots,d(k)} \in \mathbb{C}^n.$$

The map

$$y \mapsto \frac{\nabla\overline{\mathfrak{PO}}(y)}{\|\nabla\overline{\mathfrak{PO}}(y)\|} \in S^{2n-1}$$

is well defined and of degree $\mathfrak{m} \neq 0$ by the definition of multiplicity.

We define $\mathfrak{PO}^{u_0}_{*,k,\mathcal{N}}$ in the same way as (9.20). For $q \in \mathbb{C}$, we define $\mathfrak{PO}^{u_0}_{*,k,\mathcal{N}}(\cdots; q)$ by substituting q to T. Then in the same way as the proof of Lemma 9.18 we can prove the following.

Lemma 10.12. *There exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that if $|q| < \epsilon$, the equation*

$$0 = \frac{\partial}{\partial y_{k,j}} \mathfrak{PO}^{u_0}_{*,k,\mathcal{N}}(\cdots; q) \tag{10.8}$$

has a solution in $B_\delta(\mathfrak{y}^0)$. The sum of multiplicities of the solutions of (10.8) converging to $\mathfrak{y}_{k,j;0}$ is $\mathfrak{m}$.

(10.8) is a polynomial equation. Hence multiplicity of its solution is well-defined in the standard sense of algebraic geometry.

Now we assume that all the vertices of P and u_0 are contained in $\mathbb{Q}^n$. (10.8) also depends polynomially on $q' = T'$, where $T' = T^{1/\mathcal{C}!}$ for a sufficiently large integer $\mathcal{C}$. (We remark that $\mathcal{C}$ is determined by the denominators of the coordinates of the vertices of P and of u_0. In particular it can be taken to be independent of $\mathcal{N}$.)

We denote $y = (y_1, \cdots, y_n)$ and put

$$\mathfrak{X} = \{(y, q') \mid y \in B_\delta(\mathfrak{y}^0),\ q' \text{ with } |q'| < \epsilon \text{ and } q = (q')^{\mathcal{C}!} \text{ satisfying (10.8)}\}.$$

We consider the projection

$$\pi_{q'} : \mathfrak{X} \to \{q' \in \mathbb{C} \mid |q'| < \epsilon\}. \tag{10.9}$$

By choosing a sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$, we may assume that (10.9) is a local isomorphism on the punctured disc $\{q' \mid 0 < |q'| < \epsilon\}$. Namely, $\pi_{q'}$ is an étale covering over the punctured disc.

We remark that for each q' the fiber consists of at most $\mathfrak{m}$ points, since the multiplicity of the leading term equation is $\mathfrak{m}$. We put $q'' = (q')^{1/\mathfrak{m}!}$. Then the pull-back

$$\pi_{q''} : \mathfrak{X}' \to \{q'' \in \mathbb{C} \mid 0 < |q''| < \epsilon\} \tag{10.10}$$

of (10.9) becomes a trivial covering space. Namely there exists a single valued section of $\pi_{q''}$ on $\{q'' \mid 0 < |q''| < \epsilon\}$. It extends to a holomorphic section of $\{q'' \mid |q''| < \epsilon\}$.

In other words there exists a holomorphic family of solutions of (10.8) which is parameterized by $q'' \in \{q'' \mid |q''| < \epsilon\}$. We put $T'' = (T')^{1/\mathfrak{m}!}$. Then by taking the Taylor series of the q''-parameterized family of solutions at 0, we obtain the following :

Lemma 10.13. *If all the vertices of P and u_0 are rational, then for each $\mathcal{N}$ there exists $\mathfrak{y}^{(\mathcal{N})} = (\mathfrak{y}^{(\mathcal{N})}_{k,j})$*

$$\mathfrak{y}^{(\mathcal{N})}_{k,j} = \sum_{l=0}^{\mathcal{N}} \mathfrak{y}^{(\mathcal{N})}_{k,j;l} (T'')^l$$

($\mathfrak{y}^{(\mathcal{N})}_{k,j;l} \in \mathbb{C}$) such that

$$\frac{\partial \mathfrak{PO}^{u_0}_*}{\partial y_{k,j}}(\mathfrak{y}^{(\mathcal{N})}_{k,j}) \equiv 0 \mod (T'')^{\mathcal{N}+1} \tag{10.11}$$

and that $\mathfrak{y}^{(\mathcal{N})}_{k,j;0} \equiv \mathfrak{y}_{k,j;0}$.

We remark that Lemma 10.13 is sufficient for most of the applications. In fact it implies that $L(u_0)$ is balanced if there exists a weakly nondegenerate solution of leading term equation at u_0. Hence we can apply Lemma 4.12.

For completeness we prove the slightly stronger statement made for the weakly nondegenerate case in Theorem 10.4. The argument is similar to one in subsection 7.2.11 [FOOO3] (= subsection 30.11 [FOOO2]).

For each $\mathcal{N}$, we denote by $\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}((\mathfrak{y}_{k,j;0}); \mathcal{N})$ the set of all $(\mathfrak{y}^{(\mathcal{N})}_{k,j;l})_{k,j;l} \in \mathbb{C}^{n\mathcal{N}}$, where $k = 1, \cdots, K$, $j = 1, \cdots, a(k)$, $l = 1, \cdots, \mathcal{N}$, such that

$$\mathfrak{y}^{(\mathcal{N})}_{k,j} = \mathfrak{y}_{k,j;0} + \sum_{l=1}^{\mathcal{N}} \mathfrak{y}^{(\mathcal{N})}_{k,j;l} (T'')^l$$

satisfies (10.11).

By definition, $\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}((\mathfrak{y}_{k,j;0}); \mathcal{N})$ is the set of $\mathbb{C}$-valued points of certain complex affine algebraic variety (of finite dimension). Lemma 10.13 implies that $\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}((\mathfrak{y}_{k,j;0}); \mathcal{N})$ is nonempty. For $\mathcal{N}_1 > \mathcal{N}_2$ there exists an obvious morphism

$$I_{\mathcal{N}_1, \mathcal{N}_2} : \widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}((\mathfrak{y}_{k,j;0}); \mathcal{N}_1) \to \widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}((\mathfrak{y}_{k,j;0}); \mathcal{N}_2)$$

of complex algebraic variety.

To complete the proof of Theorem 10.4 in the weakly nondegenerate case, it suffices to show that the projective limit

$$\varprojlim(\widetilde{\mathfrak{M}}(\mathfrak{y}_{k,j;0};\mathcal{N})) \tag{10.12}$$

is nonempty.

Lemma 10.14.

$$\bigcap_{\mathcal{N}>1} \mathrm{Im} I_{\mathcal{N},1} \neq \emptyset.$$

Proof. By a theorem of Chevalley (see Chapter 6 [Mat]), each $\mathrm{Im}I_{\mathcal{N},1}$ is a constructible set. It is nonempty and its dimension $\dim \mathrm{Im}I_{\mathcal{N},1}$ is nonincreasing as $\mathcal{N} \to \infty$. Therefore we may assume $\dim \mathrm{Im}I_{\mathcal{N},1} = d$ for $\mathcal{N} \geq \mathcal{N}_1$.

We consider the number of d dimensional irreducible components of $\mathrm{Im}I_{\mathcal{N},1}$. This number is nonincreasing for $\mathcal{N} \geq \mathcal{N}_1$. Therefore, there exists $\mathcal{N}_2$ such that for $\mathcal{N} \geq \mathcal{N}_2$ the number of d dimensional irreducible components of $\mathrm{Im}I_{\mathcal{N},1}$ is independent of $\mathcal{N}$. It follows that there exists $X_{\mathcal{N}}$ a sequence of d dimensional irreducible components of $\mathrm{Im}I_{\mathcal{N},1}$ such that $X_{\mathcal{N}+1} \subset X_{\mathcal{N}}$. Since $\dim(X_{\mathcal{N}} \setminus X_{\mathcal{N}+1}) < d$, it follows from Baire's category theorem that $\cap_{\mathcal{N}} X_{\mathcal{N}} \neq \emptyset$. Hence the lemma. □

Lemma 10.15. *There exists a sequence* $(\mathfrak{y}^{(n)}_{k,j;l})_{k,j;l}$ $n = 1, 2, 3, \cdots m$ *such that*

$$I_{n,n-1}((\mathfrak{y}^{(n)}_{k,j;l})_{k,j;l} = (\mathfrak{y}^{(n-1)}_{k,j;l})_{k,j;l})$$

for $n = 2, \cdots, m$ *and that*

$$(\mathfrak{y}^{(m)}_{k,j;l})_{k,j;l} \in \bigcap_{\mathcal{N}>m} \mathrm{Im} I_{\mathcal{N},m}.$$

Proof. The proof is by induction on m. The case $m = 1$ is Lemma 10.14. Each of the inductive step is similar to the proof of Lemma 10.14 and so it omitted. □

Lemma 10.15 implies that the projective limit (10.12) is nonempty. The proof of weakly nondegenerate case of Theorem 10.4 is complete.

We next consider the strongly nondegenerate case. We prove the following lemma by induction on $\mathcal{N}$. Let G be a submonoid of $(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, +)$ generated by the numbers appearing in the exponent of (9.18). Namely it is generated by

$$\begin{aligned} &S_{k'} - S_k \ (k' > k), \quad \ell(u_0) + \rho - S_k \ ((\ell, \rho) \in \mathfrak{I}_{k'},\ k' \geq k), \\ &\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad \ell(u_0) - S_k \ (\ell \in \mathfrak{I}). \end{aligned} \tag{10.13}$$

We define $0 < \lambda_1 < \lambda_2 < \cdots$ by

$$\{\lambda_i \mid i = 1, 2, \dots\} = G.$$

Lemma 10.16. *We assume that* $\mathfrak{y}^0 = (\mathfrak{y}_{k,j;0})_{k=1,\cdots,K,\, j=1,\cdots,d(k)}$ *is a strongly nondegenerate solution of the leading term equation. Then, there exists*

$$\mathfrak{y}^{(\mathcal{N})}_{k,j} = \mathfrak{y}_{k,j;0} + \sum_{l=1}^{\mathcal{N}} \mathfrak{y}_{k,j;l} T^{\lambda_l}$$

such that

$$\sum_{j'=1}^{a(k)} \frac{\partial Y(k,j')}{\partial y_{k,j}} (\mathfrak{y}^{(\mathcal{N})}_{k,1}, \cdots, \mathfrak{y}^{(\mathcal{N})}_{K,d(K)}) \equiv 0 \mod T^{\lambda_{\mathcal{N}+1}}. \tag{10.14}$$

Moreover we may choose $\mathfrak{y}_{k,j}^{(\mathcal{N})}$ *so that*

$$\mathfrak{y}_{k,j}^{(\mathcal{N})} \equiv \mathfrak{y}_{k,j}^{(\mathcal{N}+1)} \mod T^{\lambda_{\mathcal{N}+1}}.$$

Proof. The proof is by induction on $\mathcal{N}$. There is nothing to show in the case $\mathcal{N} = 0$. Assume we have proved the lemma up to $\mathcal{N} - 1$. Then we have

$$\sum_{j'=1}^{a(k)} \frac{\partial Y(k,j')}{\partial y_{k,j}}(\mathfrak{y}_{k,1}^{(\mathcal{N}-1)}, \cdots, \mathfrak{y}_{K,d(K)}^{(\mathcal{N}-1)}) \equiv c_{k,j,M} T^{\mathcal{N}} \mod T^{\lambda_{\mathcal{N}+1}}.$$

Consider $\mathfrak{y}_{k,j}^{(\mathcal{N})}$ of the form

$$\mathfrak{y}_{k,j}^{(\mathcal{N})} = \mathfrak{y}_{k,j}^{(\mathcal{N}-1)} + \Delta_{k,j,\mathcal{N}} T^{\lambda_{\mathcal{N}}}$$

for some $\Delta_{k,j,\mathcal{N}}$. Then we can write

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{j'=1}^{a(k)} \frac{\partial Y(k,j')}{\partial y_{k,j}}(\mathfrak{y}_{k,1}^{(M-1)} + \Delta_{k,1,\mathcal{N}} T^{\lambda_{\mathcal{N}}}, \cdots, \mathfrak{y}_{K,d(K)}^{(\mathcal{N}-1)} + \Delta_{K,d(K),\mathcal{N}} T^{\lambda_{\mathcal{N}}}) \\ &\quad \equiv \left(c_{k,j,\mathcal{N}} + \sum_{j',j''=1}^{a(k)} \frac{\partial^2 Y(k,j')}{\partial y_{k,j} \partial y_{k,j''}} \Delta_{k,j'',\mathcal{N}} \right) T^{\lambda_{\mathcal{N}}} \mod T^{\lambda_{\mathcal{N}+1}}. \end{aligned} \tag{10.15}$$

Since $\mathfrak{y}^0 = (\mathfrak{y}_{k,j;0})_{k=1,\cdots,K,\, j=1,\cdots,d(k)}$ is strongly nondegenerate, we can find $\Delta_{k,j'',\mathcal{N}} \in \mathbb{C}$ so that the right hand side become zero module $T^{\lambda_{\mathcal{N}+1}}$. The proof of Lemma 10.16 is complete. □

By Lemma 10.16, the limit $\lim_{\mathcal{N}\to\infty} \mathfrak{y}_{k,j}^{(\mathcal{N})}$ exists. We set

$$\mathfrak{y}_{k,j} := \lim_{\mathcal{N}\to\infty} \mathfrak{y}_{k,j}^{(\mathcal{N})}.$$

This is the required solution of (10.4). The proof of Theorem 10.4 is complete □

Proof of Lemma 10.11. We put

$$\mathfrak{y}_{k,j} = \mathfrak{y}_{k,j;0} + \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \mathfrak{y}_{k,j;l} T^{\lambda_l}.$$

By assumption $\mathfrak{y}_{k,j;0} \in F$. We remark that (10.15) gives a *linear* equation which determines $\mathfrak{y}_{k,j;l}$ inductively on l. We use it to show $\mathfrak{y}_{k,j;l} \in F$ inductively on l. □

We next give an example where weakly nondegeneracy condition is not satisfied.

Example 10.17. Consider the 2-point blow up $X(\alpha, \beta)$ of $\mathbb{C}P^2$ with its moment polytope given by

$$P = \{(u_1, u_2) \mid 0 \le u_1 \le 1,\ 0 \le u_2 \le 1 - \alpha,\ \beta \le u_1 + u_2 \le 1\}.$$

We consider the case when $1 - \alpha$ is sufficiently small. The potential function is

$$\mathfrak{PO} = T^{u_1} y_1 + T^{u_2} y_2 + T^{1-\alpha-u_2} y_2^{-1} + T^{1-u_1-u_2} y_1^{-1} y_2^{-1} + T^{u_1+u_2-\beta} y_1 y_2.$$

(We remark that X is Fano.) We fix α and move β starting from zero. When β is small compared to $1 - \alpha$, there are two balanced fibers.

One is located at $((1+\alpha)/4, (1-\alpha)/2)$. This corresponds to the location of the balanced fiber of the one point blow up, which is nothing but the case $\beta = 0$. The

other appears near the origin and is (β, β). The leading term equation at the first point is

$$1 - y_2^{-2} = 0, \quad 1 - y_1^{-2} y_2^{-1} = 0.$$

The solutions are $(y_1, y_2) = (\pm 1, 1), (\pm\sqrt{-1}, -1)$, all of which are strongly nondegenerate. The leading term equation at the second point is

$$1 + y_1 = 1 + y_2 = 0.$$

$(-1, -1)$ is the nondegenerate solution. Thus we have 5 solutions.

The situation jumps when $\beta = (1-\alpha)/2$. Denote $\beta_0 = (1-\alpha)/2$ for the simplicity of notation. In that case the potential function at (β_0, β_0) becomes

$$T^{\beta_0}(y_1 + y_2 + y_1 y_2 + y_2^{-1}) + T^{1-2\beta_0} y_1^{-1} y_2^{-1}.$$

The leading term equation is

$$1 + y_2 = 0, \quad 1 + y_1 - y_2^{-2} = 0.$$

Its solution is $(0, -1)$. Since $y_1 = 0$ it follows that there is no solution in $(\Lambda_0 \setminus \Lambda_+)^2$. Hence there is no weak bounding cochain $\mathfrak{x}$ for which the Floer cohomology $HF((L(\beta_0, \beta_0), \mathfrak{x}), (L(\beta_0, \beta_0), \mathfrak{x}); \Lambda)$ is nontrivial. In other words, the fiber $L(\beta_0, \beta_0)$ in $X(\alpha, \beta_0)$ is not strongly balanced.

On the other hand, this fiber $L(\beta_0, \beta_0)$ in $X(\alpha, \beta_0)$ is balanced because by choosing β arbitrarily close to β_0 and $\beta < \beta_0$, we can approximate it by the fibers

$$L(\beta, \beta) \subset X(\alpha, \beta)$$

for which the Floer cohomology $HF((L(\beta, \beta), \mathfrak{x}), (L(\beta, \beta), \mathfrak{x}))$ is non-trivial. In particular $L(\beta_0, \beta_0)$ in $X(\alpha, \beta_0)$ is not displaceable.

We can also verify that

$$\overline{\mathfrak{E}}(\beta_0, \beta_0) = \infty \quad \text{in } X(\alpha, \beta_0) \tag{10.16}$$

while $\mathfrak{E}(\beta_0, \beta_0) = \beta_0$ in $X(\alpha_0, \beta_0)$.

Now we examine where the missing solutions at $\beta = \beta_0$ have gone. We consider $(u_1, (1-\alpha)/2)$ where $\beta_0 = (1-\alpha)/2 < u_1 < (1+\alpha)/4$. The potential function is

$$T^{\beta_0}(y_2 + y_2^{-1}) + T^{\beta_0 + \lambda_1}(y_1 + y_1 y_2) + T^{\beta_0 + \lambda_2} y_1^{-1} y_2^{-1}. \tag{10.17}$$

Here

$$\lambda_1 = u_1 - \beta_0 < \lambda_2 = (1+\alpha)/2 - u_1 - \beta_0.$$

The leading term equation is

$$1 - y_2^{-2} = 0, \quad 1 + y_2 = 0. \tag{10.18}$$

The solution is $y_2 = -1$ and y_1 is arbitrary. Thus there are infinitely many solutions of the leading term equation. Therefore these solutions of (10.18) are not weakly nondegenerate.

So we need to study the critical point of (10.17) more carefully. The condition that (y_1, y_2) is a critical point of (10.17) is written as

$$\begin{cases} 1 - y_2^{-2} + T^{\lambda_1} y_1 - T^{\lambda_2} y_1^{-1} y_2^{-2} = 0 \\ 1 + y_2 - T^{\lambda_2 - \lambda_1} y_1^{-2} y_2^{-1} = 0. \end{cases} \tag{10.19}$$

The leading order term of y_2 should be -1. We need to study also the second order term. We can write

$$y_2 = -1 + cT^{\mu}, \quad y_1 = d,$$

where $c, d \in \Lambda_0 \setminus \Lambda_+$. Then we have

$$-2cT^{\mu} + dT^{\lambda_1} \equiv 0 \mod T^{\min\{\mu,\lambda_1\}}\Lambda_+, \tag{10.20}$$

$$cT^{\mu} + d^{-2}T^{\lambda_2-\lambda_1} \equiv 0 \mod T^{\min\{\mu,\lambda_2-\lambda_1\}}\Lambda_+. \tag{10.21}$$

(10.20) implies $\mu = \lambda_1$. (10.21) then implies $\lambda_2 - \lambda_1 = \lambda_1$. It implies $u_1 = 1/3$. Furthermore

$$c^3 \equiv -1/4 \mod \Lambda_+, \quad d \equiv 2c \mod \Lambda_+. \tag{10.22}$$

Since the three solutions of the $\mathbb{C}$-reduction of (10.22) are all simple, we can show, by the same way as that of the proof of Theorem 10.4, that all solutions correspond to solutions of the equation (10.19). Therefore, $L(1/3, \beta_0)$ is a strongly balanced fiber.

We remark that solutions of the leading term equation (10.18) do not lift to solutions of (10.19) unless $u_1 = 1/3$ and $y_1 = -1$. This shows that the weakly nondegeneracy assumption in Theorem 10.4 is essential.

We remark that at $((1+\alpha)/4, (1-\alpha)/2)$ the leading term equation becomes

$$1 - y_2^{-2} = 0, \quad 1 + y_2 - y_1^{-2}y_2^{-1} = 0.$$

Its solutions in $(\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\})^2$ are $(\pm 1/\sqrt{2}, 1)$. The number of solutions jumps from 4 to 2 here. $2 + 3 = 5$. So this is consistent with Theorem 1.3.

In summary for the case of (α, β_0) with $\beta_0 = (1-\alpha)/2$, there are 3 balanced fibers $(1/3, \beta_0)$, $((1+\alpha)/4, \beta_0)$ and (β_0, β_0). The first two of them are strongly balanced and the last is not strongly balanced.

The balanced fiber $L(1/3, \beta_0) \subset X(\alpha, \beta_0)$ disappears as we deform $X(\alpha, \beta_0)$ to $X(\alpha, \beta)$ as β_0 moves to nearby β. To see this let us take β which is slightly bigger than $\beta_0 = (1-\alpha)/2$. Then $((\alpha+\beta)/2, (1-\alpha)/2)$, and $(1-\alpha-\beta, \beta)$ are the balanced fibers. The leading term equation at the first point is

$$1 - y_2^{-2} = 0, \quad y_2 - y_1^{-2}y_2^{-1} = 0.$$

Hence there are 4 solutions $(\pm 1, \pm 1)$. The leading term equation at the second point is

$$1 + y_2 = 0, \quad y_1 - y_2^{-2} = 0.$$

Hence the solution is $(1, -1)$. Total number is again 5.

We remark that the $\mathbb{Q}$-structure of quantum cohomology also jumps at $\beta = (1-\alpha)/2$. Namely

$$QH(X(\alpha,\beta); \Lambda^{\mathbb{Q}}) = \begin{cases} \Lambda^{\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{-1})} \times (\Lambda^{\mathbb{Q}})^3 & \beta \text{ is slightly smaller than } (1-\alpha)/2, \\ \Lambda^{\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{2})} \times \Lambda^{\mathbb{Q}((-2)^{1/3})} & \beta = (1-\alpha)/2, \\ (\Lambda^{\mathbb{Q}})^5 & \beta \text{ is slightly larger than } (1-\alpha)/2. \end{cases}$$

Remark 10.18. In a sequel of this series of papers, we will prove that $L(u_1, (1-\alpha)/2))$ is not displacable for any $u_1 \in ((1-\alpha)/2, 1/3) \cup (1/3, (1+\alpha)/4)$, in the case $\beta = \beta_0$. We will use the bulk deformation introduced by [FOOO3] section 3.8 (= [FOOO2] section 13) to prove it.

The next example shows that Theorems 1.3, 1.4 and 10.4 can not be generalized to the case of a positive characteristic.

Example 10.19. Consider the 2-point blow up X of $\mathbb{C}P^2$ with moment polytope

$$P = \{(u_1, u_2) \mid 0 \le u_i \le 1 - \epsilon, \sum u_i \le 1\}.$$

Since X is monotone for $\epsilon = 1/3$, it follows that X is Fano. We will assume $\epsilon > 0$ is sufficiently small. Then the fiber at $u_0 = (1/3, 1/3)$ is balanced.

Now we consider the Novikov ring Λ^F with $F = \mathbb{F}_3$ a field of characteristic 3. We will prove that there exists *no* element $\mathfrak{x} \in H(L(u); \Lambda_0^F)$ such that $HF((L(u_0), \mathfrak{x}), (L(u_0), \mathfrak{x}); \Lambda^F) \neq 0$.

The potential function at u_0 is

$$\mathfrak{PO}^{u_0} = T^{1/3}(y_1 + y_2 + 1/(y_1 y_2)) + T^{2/3-\epsilon}(y_1^{-1} + y_2^{-1}).$$

Therefore the critical point equation is given by

$$1 - 1/(y_i y_1 y_2) - t y_i^{-2} = 0 \quad i = 1, 2 \tag{10.23}$$

where $t = T^{1/3-\epsilon}$. From this it follows that $y_i \equiv 1 \mod \Lambda_+$. In fact the leading term equation is $a_i a_1 a_2 = 1$ for $i = 1, 2$ which is reduced to

$$a_1 = a_2 = a, \quad a^3 = 1.$$

Obviously this equation has the unique solution $a_1 = a_2 = 1$ in $\mathbb{F}_3$.

Going back to the study of solutions of the critical point equation (10.23), we first prove $y_1 = y_2$. We put $z_i = y_i^{-1}$. We assume $z_i - z_j \neq 0$ and put $z_i - z_j \equiv t^\lambda c \mod t^\lambda \Lambda_+$ with $c \in \mathbb{F}_3 \setminus \{0\}$. Then by (10.23) we have

$$(z_i - z_j) z_1 z_2 + t(z_i - z_j)(z_i + z_j) = 0.$$

This is a contradiction since the left hand side is congruent to ct^λ modulo $t^\lambda \Lambda_+^{\mathbb{F}_3}$.

We now put $x = y_i$ and obtain

$$x^3 - tx - 1 = 0. \tag{10.24}$$

We prove:

Lemma 10.20. (*10.24*) *has no solution in* $\Lambda_0^{\mathbb{F}_3}$.

Proof. We put $x = 1 + t^{1/3} x'$ and obtain

$$(x')^3 - t^{1/3} x' - 1 = 0.$$

This equation resembles (10.24) except that t is replaced by $t^{1/3}$. We now put

$$x_N \equiv 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{N} t^{\sum_{i=1}^{k} 3^{-i}}.$$

Then $x_N^3 = 1 + t x_{N-1}$. Therefore

$$(x_N)^3 - t x_N - 1 = -t^{1+\sum_{i=1}^{N} 3^{-i}}.$$

Namely x_N is a solution of (10.24) modulo $t^{1+\sum_{i=1}^{N} 3^{-i}}$. It is easy to see that there are no other solution of (10.24) modulo $t^{1+\sum_{i=1}^{N} 3^{-i}}$.

However since

$$1 + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} 3^{-i} = \frac{3}{2} < \infty,$$

it follows that

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} x_N$$

does *not* converge in $\Lambda_0^{\mathbb{F}_3}$. Thus there is no solution of (10.24) over a field of characteristic 3. □

Lemma 10.20 implies that the field of fraction of the Puiseux series ring with coefficients in an algebraically closed field of *positive* characteristic is *not* algebraically closed. It is well known that this phenomenon does not occur in the case of characteristic zero. See, for example, Corollary 13.15 [Ei]. Since we could not find a proof of a similar result for universal Novikov ring in the literature, we will provide its proof in the appendix for completeness. (We used it in the proof of Theorem 1.12 in section 7.)

11. Calculation of potential function

In this section, we prove Theorems 4.5 and 4.6. We begin with a review of [CO]. Let $\pi : X \to P$ be the moment map and $\partial P = \bigcup_{i=1}^m \partial_i P$ be the decomposition of the boundary of P into $n-1$ dimensional faces. Let $\beta_i \in H_2(X, L(u); \mathbb{Z})$ be the elements such that

$$\beta_i \cap [\pi^{-1}(\partial P_j)] = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i = j, \\ 0 & \text{if } i \neq j. \end{cases}$$

The Maslov index $\mu(\beta_i)$ is 2. (Theorem 5.1 [CO].)

Let $\beta \in \pi_2(X, L(u))$ and $\mathcal{M}_{k+1}^{\text{main}}(L(u), \beta)$ be the moduli space of stable maps from bordered Riemann surfaces of genus zero with $k+1$ boundary marked points in homology class β. (See [FOOO1] section 3 = [FOOO3] subsection 2.1.2. We require the boundary marked points to respect the cyclic order of $S^1 = \partial D^2$. (In other words we consider the main component in the sense of [FOOO1] section 3.)) Let $\mathcal{M}_{k+1}^{\text{main,reg}}(L(u), \beta)$ be its subset consisting of all maps from a disc. (Namely the stable map without disc or sphere bubble.) The next theorem easily follows from the results of [CO]. In (3) Theorem 11.1 we use the spin structure of $L(u)$ which is induced by the diffeomorphism of $L(u) \cong T^n$ by the T^n action and the standard trivialization of the tangent bundle of T^n.

Theorem 11.1. (1) *If $\mu(\beta) < 0$, or $\mu(\beta) = 0$, $\beta \neq 0$, then $\mathcal{M}_{k+1}^{\text{main,reg}}(L(u), \beta)$ is empty.*

(2) *If $\mu(\beta) = 2$, $\beta \neq \beta_1, \cdots, \beta_m$, then $\mathcal{M}_{k+1}^{\text{main,reg}}(L(u), \beta)$ is empty.*

(3) *For $i = 1, \cdots, m$, we have*

$$\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{main,reg}}(L(u), \beta_i) = \mathcal{M}_1^{\text{main}}(L(u), \beta_i). \tag{11.1}$$

Moreover $\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{main}}(L(u), \beta_i)$ is Fredholm regular. Furthermore the evaluation map

$$ev : \mathcal{M}_1^{\text{main}}(L(u), \beta_i) \to L(u)$$

is an orientation preserving diffeomorphism.

(4) *For any β, the moduli space $\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{main,reg}}(L(u), \beta)$ is Fredholm regular. Moreover*

$$ev : \mathcal{M}_1^{\text{main,reg}}(L(u), \beta) \to L(u)$$

is a submersion.

(5) *If $\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{main}}(L(u), \beta)$ is not empty then there exists $k_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and $\alpha_j \in H_2(X; \mathbb{Z})$ such that*

$$\beta = \sum_i k_i \beta_i + \sum_j \alpha_j$$

and α_j is realized by holomorphic sphere. There is at least one nonzero k_i.

Proof. For reader's convenience and completeness, we explain how to deduce Theorem 11.1 from the results in [CO].

By Theorems 5.5 and 6.1 [CO], $\mathcal{M}_{k+1}^{\text{main,reg}}(L(u),\beta)$ is Fredholm regular for any β. Since the complex structure is invariant under the T^n action and $L(u)$ is T^n invariant, it follows that T^n acts on $\mathcal{M}_{k+1}^{\text{main,reg}}(L(u),\beta)$ and

$$ev : \mathcal{M}_{k+1}^{\text{main,reg}}(L(u),\beta) \to L(u)$$

is T^n equivariant. Since the T^n action on $L(u)$ is free and transitive, it follows that ev is a submersion if $\mathcal{M}_{k+1}^{\text{main,reg}}(L(u),\beta)$ is nonempty. (4) follows.

We assume $\mathcal{M}_{k+1}^{\text{main,reg}}(L(u),\beta)$ is nonempty. Since ev is a submersion it follows that

$$n = \dim L(u) \leq \dim \mathcal{M}_{k+1}^{\text{main,reg}}(L(u),\beta) = n + \mu(\beta) - 2$$

if $\beta \neq 0$. Therefore $\mu(\beta) \geq 2$. (1) follows.

We next assume $\mu(\beta) = 2$, and $\mathcal{M}_{k+1}^{\text{main,reg}}(L(u),\beta)$ is nonempty. Then by Theorem 5.3 [CO], we find $\beta = \beta_i$ for some i. (2) follows.

We next prove (5). It suffices to consider

$$[f] \in \mathcal{M}_1^{\text{main}}(L(u),\beta) \setminus \mathcal{M}_1^{\text{main,reg}}(L(u),\beta).$$

We decompose the domain of u into irreducible components and restrict f there. Let $f_j : D^2 \to M$ and $g_k : S^2 \to M$ be the restriction of f to disc or sphere components respectively. We have

$$\beta = \sum [f_j] + \sum [g_k].$$

Theorem 5.3 [CO] implies that each of f_j is homologous to the sum of the element of β_i. It implies (5).

We finally prove (3). The fact that ev is a diffeomorphism for $\beta = \beta_i$, follows dirctly from Theorem 5.3 [CO]. We next prove that ev is orientation preserving. Since $L(u), u \in \operatorname{Int} P$, is a principal homogeneous space of T^n, the tangent bundle $TL(u)$ is trivialized once we fix an isomorphism $T^n \equiv S^1 \times \cdots \times S^1$. Using the orientation and the spin structure on $L(u)$ induced by such a trivialization, we orient the moduli space $\mathcal{M}_1(\beta)$ of holomorprhic discs. If we change the identification $T^n \equiv S^1 \times \cdots \times S^1$ by an orientation preserving, (resp. reversing), isomorphism, the corresponding orientations on $L(u)$ and $\mathcal{M}_1(\beta)$ is preserved, (resp. reversed). Therefore whether $ev : \mathcal{M}(\beta_i) \to L(u)$ is orientation preserving or not does not depend on the choice of the identification T^n and $S^1 \times \cdots \times S^1$.

For each $i = 1, \ldots, m$, we can find an automorphism ϕ of $(\mathbb{C}^*)^n$ and a biholomorphic map $f : X \setminus \cup_{j \neq i} \pi^{-1}(\partial_j P) \to \mathbb{C} \times (\mathbb{C}^*)^{n-1}$ such that

(1) f is ϕ-equivariant,

(2) $f(L(u)) = L_{\text{std}}$, where $L_{\text{std}} = \{(w_1, \ldots, w_n) \in (\mathbb{C})^n | |w_1| = \cdots = |w_n| = 1\}$.

Under this identification, $\mathcal{M}_1(\beta_i)$ is identified with the space of holomorphic discs

$$z \in D^2 \mapsto (\zeta \cdot z, w_2, \ldots, w_n) \in \mathbb{C} \times (\mathbb{C}^*)^{n-1}, \quad \zeta \in S^1 \subset \mathbb{C}^*,$$

where $w_k \in \mathbb{C}, k = 2, \ldots, n$ with $|w_k| = 1$. Therefore it is enough to check the statement that ev is orientation preserving in a single example. Cho [Cho] proved it in the case of the Clifford torus in $\mathbb{C}P^n$, hence the proof.

To prove (11.1) and complete the proof of Theorem 11.1, it remains to prove $\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{main,reg}}(L(u),\beta_{i_0}) = \mathcal{M}_1^{\text{main}}(L(u),\beta_{i_0})$. (Here $i_0 \in \{1, \cdots, m\}$.) Let $[f] \in$

$\mathcal{M}_1^{\rm main}(L(u), \beta_{i_0})$. We take k_i and α_j as in (5). (Here $\beta = \beta_{i_0}$). We have

$$\partial\beta_{i_0} = \sum_i k_i \partial\beta_i.$$

Using the convexity of P, (5) and $k_i \geq 0$, we show the inequality

$$\beta_{i_0} \cap \omega \leq \sum_i k_i \beta_i \cap \omega \tag{11.2}$$

holds and that the equality holds only if $k_i = 0$ $(i \neq i_0)$, $k_{i_0} = 1$, as follows : By (5) we have

$$\ell_{i_0} = \sum_{i=1}^m k_i \ell_i + c$$

where c is a constant. Since $k_i \geq 0$ and $\ell_{i_0}(u') = 0$ for $u' \in \partial_{i_0} P$, it follows that $c \leq 0$. (Note $\ell_i \geq 0$ on P.) Since $\beta_i \cap \omega = \ell_i(u)$, we have the inequality (11.2). Let us assume that the equality holds. If there exists $i \neq j$ with $k_i, k_j > 0$ then

$$\partial_{i_0} P = \{u' \in P \mid \ell_{i_0}(u') = 0\} \subseteq \{u' \in P \mid \ell_i(u') = \ell_j(u') = 0\} \subseteq \partial_i P \cap \partial_j P.$$

This is a contradiction since $\partial_{i_0} P$ is codimension 1. Therefore there is only one nonzero k_i. It is easy to see that $i = i_0$ and $k_{i_0} = 1$.

On the other hand since $\alpha_j \cap \omega > 0$ it follows that

$$\beta_{i_0} \cap \omega \geq \sum_i k_i \beta_i \cap \omega.$$

Therefore there is no sphere bubble (that is α_j). Moreover the equality holds in (11.2). Hence the domain of our stable map is irreducible. Namely

$$\mathcal{M}_1^{\rm main,reg}(L(u), \beta_{i_0}) = \mathcal{M}_1^{\rm main}(L(u), \beta_{i_0}).$$

The proof of Theorem 11.1 is now complete. □

Next we discuss one delicate point to apply Theorem 11.1 to the proofs of Theorems 4.5 and 4.6. (This point was already mentioned in section 16 [CO].) Let us consider the case where there exists a holomorphic sphere $g : S^2 \to X$ with

$$c_1(X) \cap g_*[S^2] < 0.$$

We assume moreover that there exists a holomorphic disc $f : (D^2, \partial D^2) \to (X, L(u))$ such that

$$f(0) = g(1).$$

We glue D^2 and S^2 at $0 \in D^2$ and $1 \in S^2$ to obtain Σ. f and g induce a stable map $h : (\Sigma, \partial\Sigma) \to (X, L(u))$.

In general h will *not* be Fredholm regular since g may not be Fredholm regular or the evaluation is not transversal at the interior nodes. In other words, elements of $\mathcal{M}_1^{\rm main}(L(u), \beta) \setminus \mathcal{M}_1^{\rm main,reg}(L(u), \beta)$ may not be Fredholm regular in general. Moreover replacing g by its multiple cover, we obtain an element of $\mathcal{M}_1^{\rm main}(L(u), \beta) \setminus \mathcal{M}_1^{\rm main,reg}(L(u), \beta)$ such that $\mu(\beta)$ is negative. Theorem 11.1 says that all the holomorphic disc without any bubble are Fredholm regular. However we can not expect that all stable maps in $\mathcal{M}_1^{\rm main}(L(u), \beta)$ are Fredholm regular.

In order to prove Theorem 4.6, we need to find appropriate perturbations of those stable maps. For this purpose we use the T^n action and proceed as follows. (We remark that many of the arguments below are much simplified in the Fano case, where there exists no holomorphic sphere g with $c_1(M) \cap g_*[S^2] \leq 0$.)

We equip each of $\mathcal{M}_1(L(u),\beta)$ with Kuranishi structure. (See [FO] for the general theory of Kuranishi structure and section 17-18 [FOOO1] (or section 7.1 [FOOO3] = section 29 [FOOO2]) for its construction in the context we currently deal with.) We may construct Kuranishi neighborhoods and obstruction bundles that carry T^n actions induced by the T^n action on X, and choose T^n-equivariant Kuranishi maps. (See Definition 15.4.) We note that the evaluation map

$$ev : \mathcal{M}_1(L(u),\beta) \to L(u)$$

is T^n-equivariant. We use the fact that the complex structure of X is T^n-invariant and $L(u)$ is a free T^n-orbit to find such a Kuranishi structure. (See Proposition 15.7 for the detail.)

We remark that the T^n action on the Kuranishi neighborhood is free since the T^n action on $L(u)$ is free and ev is T^n equivariant. We take a perturbation (that is, a multisection) of the Kuranishi map that is T^n equivariant. We can find such a multisection which is also transversal to 0 as follows : Since the T^n action is free, we can take the quotient of Kuranishi neighborhood, obstruction bundle etc. to obtain a space with Kuranishi structure. Then we take a transversal multisection of the quotient Kuranishi structure and lift it to a multisection of the Kuranishi neighborhood of $\mathcal{M}_1(L(u),\beta)$. (See Corollary 15.15 for detail.) Let $\mathfrak{s}_\beta$ be such a multisection and let $\mathcal{M}_1(L(u),\beta)^{\mathfrak{s}_\beta}$ be its zero set. We remark that the evaluation map

$$ev : \mathcal{M}_1(L(u),\beta)^{\mathfrak{s}_\beta} \to L(u) \tag{11.3}$$

is a submersion. This follows from the T^n equivariance. This makes our construction of system of multisections much simpler than the general one in section 7.2 [FOOO3] (= section 30 [FOOO2]) since the fiber product appearing in the inductive construction is automatically transversal. (See subsection 7.2.2 [FOOO3] = section 30.2 [FOOO2]) for the reason why this is crucial.) More precisely we prove the following Lemma 11.2. Let

$$\mathfrak{forget}_0 : \mathcal{M}^{\rm main}_{k+1}(L(u),\beta) \to \mathcal{M}^{\rm main}_1(L(u),\beta) \tag{11.4}$$

be the forgetful map which forgets the first, ..., k-th marked points. (In other words, only the 0-th marked point remains.) We can construct our Kuranishi structure so that it is compatible with $\mathfrak{forget}_0$ in the same sense as Lemma 7.3.8 [FOOO3] (= Lemma 31.8 [FOOO2]).

Lemma 11.2. *For each given $E > 0$, there exists a system of multisections $\mathfrak{s}_{\beta,k+1}$ on $\mathcal{M}^{\rm main}_{k+1}(L(u),\beta)$ for $\beta \cap \omega < E$ with the following properties :*

1. *They are transversal to* 0.
2. *They are invariant under the T^n action.*
3. *The multisection $\mathfrak{s}_{\beta,k+1}$ is the pull-back of the multisection $\mathfrak{s}_{\beta,1}$ by the forgetful map (11.4).*
4. *The restriction of $\mathfrak{s}_{\beta,1}$ to the boundary of $\mathcal{M}^{\rm main}_1(L(u),\beta)$ is the fiber product of the multisections $\mathfrak{s}_{\beta',k'}$ with respect to the identification of the boundary*

$$\partial\mathcal{M}^{\rm main}_1(L(u),\beta) = \bigcup_{\beta_1+\beta_2=\beta} \mathcal{M}^{\rm main}_1(L(u),\beta_1)_{ev_0} \times_{ev_1} \mathcal{M}^{\rm main}_2(L(u),\beta_2).$$

5. *We do not perturb $\mathcal{M}^{\rm main}_1(L(u),\beta_i)$ for $i = 1, \cdots, m$.*

Proof. We construct multisections inductively over $\omega \cap \beta$. Since (2) implies that fiber products of the perturbed moduli spaces which we have already constructed in the earlier stage of induction are automatically transversal, we can extend them so that (1), (2), (3), (4) are satisfied by the method we already explained above. We recall from Theorem 11.1 (3) that

$$\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{main}}(L(u), \beta_i) = \mathcal{M}_1^{\text{main,reg}}(L(u), \beta_i)$$

and it is Fredholm regular and its evaluation map is surjective to $L(u)$. Therefore when we perturb the multisection we do not need to worry about compatibility of it with other multisections we have already constructed in the earlier stage of induction. This enable us to leave the moduli space $\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{main}}(L(u), \beta_i)$ unperturbed for all β_i. The proof of Lemma 11.2 is complete. □

Remark 11.3. We need to fix E and stop the inductive construction of multisections at some finite stage. Namely we define $s_{\beta,k+1}$ only for β with $\beta \cap \omega < E$. The reason is explained in subsection 7.2.3 [FOOO3] (= section 30.3 [FOOO2]). We can go around this trouble in the same way as explained in section 7.2 [FOOO3] (= section 30 [FOOO2]). See Remark 11.11.

Remark 11.4. We explain one delicate point of the proof of Lemma 11.2. Let $\alpha \in \pi_2(X)$ be represented by a holomorphic sphere with $c_1(X) \cap \alpha < 0$. We consider the moduli space $\mathcal{M}_1(\alpha)$ of holomorphic sphere with one marked point and in homology class α. Let us consider $\beta \in \pi_2(X; L(u))$ and the moduli space $\mathcal{M}_{k+1,1}^{\text{main}}(\beta)$ of holomorphic discs with one interior and $k+1$ boundary marked points and of homotopy class β. The fiber product

$$\mathcal{M}_1(\alpha) \times_X \mathcal{M}_{k+1,1}^{\text{main}}(\beta)$$

taken by the evaluation maps at interior marked points are contained in $\mathcal{M}_{k+1,1}^{\text{main}}(\beta + \alpha)$. If we want to define a multisection compatible with the embedding

$$\mathcal{M}_1(\alpha) \times_X \mathcal{M}_{k+1,1}^{\text{main}}(\beta) \subset \mathcal{M}_{k+1}^{\text{main}}(\beta + \alpha) \tag{11.5}$$

then it is impossible to make it both transversal and T^n equivariant in general : This is because the nodal point of such a singular curve could be contained in the part of X with non-trivial isotropy group.

Our perturbation constructed above satisfies (1) and (2) of Lemma 11.2 and so may *not* be compatible with the embedding (11.5). Our construction of the perturbation given in Lemma 11.2 exploits the fact that the T^n action acts freely on the Lagrangian fiber $L(u)$ and carried out by induction on the number of *disc* components (and of energy) only, regardless of the number of sphere components.

The following corollary is an immediate consequence of Lemma 11.2.

Corollary 11.5. *If $\mu(\beta) < 0$ or $\mu(\beta) = 0$, $\beta \neq 0$, then $\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{main}}(L(u), \beta)^{s_\beta}$ is empty.*

Now we consider $\beta \in \pi_2(X; L)$ with $\mu(\beta) = 2$ and $\beta \cap \omega < E$, where E is as in Lemma 11.2. One immediate consequence of Corollary 11.5 is that the virtual fundamental chain of $\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{main}}(L(u), \beta)$ becomes a *cycle*. More precisely, we introduce

Definition 11.6. Let $\beta \in \pi_2(X; L)$ with $\mu(\beta) = 2$ and $\beta \cap \omega < E$, where E is as in Lemma 11.2. We define a homology class $c_\beta \in H_n(L(u); \mathbb{Q}) \cong \mathbb{Q}$ by the pushforward

$$c_\beta = ev_*([\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{main}}(L(u), \beta)^{s_\beta}]).$$

Lemma 11.7. *The number c_β is independent of the choice of the system of multi-sections $\mathfrak{s}_{\beta,k+1}$ satisfying* (1) - (5) *of Proposition 11.2.*

Proof. If there are two such systems, we can find a T^n invariant homotopy between them which is also transversal to 0. By a dimension counting argument applied to the parameterized version of $\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{main}}(L(u),\beta)$ and its perturbation, we will have the parameterized version of Corollary 11.5. This in turn implies that the perturbed (parameterized) moduli space defines a compact cobordism between the perturbed moduli spaces of $\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{main}}(\beta)$ associated to the two such systems. The lemma follows. □

We remark $c_{\beta_i} = 1$ where β_i $(i = 1, \cdots, m)$ are the classes corresponding to each of the irreducible components of the divisor $\pi^{-1}(\partial P)$. If X is Fano, then $c_\beta = 0$, for $\beta \neq \beta_i$. But this may not be the case if X is not Fano.

We now will use our perturbed moduli space to define a structure of filtered A_∞ algebra on the de Rham cohomology $H(L(u);\Lambda_0^{\mathbb{R}}) \cong (H(L(u),\mathbb{R})) \otimes \Lambda_0$. We will write it $\mathfrak{m}^{can}$.

We take a T^n equivariant Riemannian metric on $L(u)$. We observe that a differential form ρ on $L(u)$ is harmonic if and only if ρ is T^n equivariant. So we identify $H(L(u),\mathbb{R})$ with the set of T^n equivariant forms from now on.

We consider the evaluation map

$$ev = (ev_1, \cdots, ev_k, ev_0) : \mathcal{M}_{k+1}^{\text{main}}(L(u),\beta)^{\mathfrak{s}_\beta} \to L(u)^{k+1}.$$

Let $\rho_1, \cdots, \rho_k$ be T^n equivariant differential forms on $L(u)$. We define

$$\mathfrak{m}_{k,\beta}^{can}(\rho_1, \cdots, \rho_k) = (ev_0)_!(ev_1, \cdots, ev_k)^*(\rho_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \rho_k). \tag{11.6}$$

We remark that integration along fiber $(ev_0)_!$ is well defined and gives a smooth form, since ev_0 is a submersion. (It is a consequence of T^n equivariance.) More precisely, we apply Definition 16.7 in section 16 as follows. We put $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_{k+1}^{\text{main}}(L(u),\beta)$, $L_s = L^k$, $L_t = L$. $ev_s = (ev_1, \cdots, ev_k) : \mathcal{M} \to L_s$, $ev_t = ev_0 : \mathcal{M} \to L_t$. Thus we are in the situation we formulate at the beginning of section 16. Then using Lemma 16.9 and Remark 16.8 (1), we put

$$\mathfrak{m}_{k,\beta}^{can}(\rho_1, \cdots, \rho_k) = (\mathcal{M}; ev_s, ev_t, \mathfrak{s}_\beta)_*(\rho_1 \times \cdots \times \rho_k). \tag{11.7}$$

We remark that the right hand side of (11.7) is again T^n equivariant since $\mathfrak{s}_\beta$ etc. are T^n equivariant.

Lemma 11.2 (4) implies

$$\begin{aligned}&\partial\mathcal{M}_{k+1}^{\text{main}}(L(u),\beta)\\ &= \bigcup_{k_1+k_2=k+1} \bigcup_{\beta_1+\beta_2=\beta} \bigcup_{l=1}^{k_2} \mathcal{M}_{k_1+1}^{\text{main}}(L(u),\beta_1)_{ev_0} \times_{ev_l} \mathcal{M}_{k_2+1}^{\text{main}}(L(u),\beta_2).\end{aligned}$$

Therefore using Lemmata 16.9, 16.10, we have the following formula.

$$\sum_{\beta_1+\beta_2=\beta} \sum_{k_1+k_2=k+1} \sum_{l=1}^{k_1} (-1)^* \mathfrak{m}_{k_1,\beta_1}^{can}(\rho_1, \cdots, \mathfrak{m}_{k_2,\beta_2}^{can}(\rho_l, \cdots), \cdots, \rho_k). \tag{11.8}$$

Here $* = \sum_{i=1}^{l}(\deg \rho_i + 1)$. (See the end of section 16 for sign.) We now put

$$\mathfrak{m}_k^{can}(\rho_1, \cdots, \rho_k) = \sum_\beta T^{\beta\cap\omega/(2\pi)} \mathfrak{m}_{k,\beta}^{can}(\rho_1, \cdots, \rho_k). \tag{11.9}$$

We extend (11.9) to $\rho \in H(L(u);\Lambda_0^{\mathbb{R}})$ such that it is Λ_0 multilinear. Then (11.8) implies that it defines a structure of a filtered A_∞ structure on $H(L(u);\Lambda_0^{\mathbb{R}})$ in the sense of section 3.

We also remark that our filtered A_∞ algebra is unital and the constant 0 form $1 \in H^0(L;\mathbb{R})$ is a unit. This is a consequence of Lemma 11.2 (3).

We next calculate our filtered A_∞ structure in the case when ρ_i are degree 1 forms.

Lemma 11.8. *For $\mathfrak{x} \in H^1(L(u),\Lambda_0)$ and $\beta \in \pi_2(X,L)$ with $\mu(\beta) = 2$, we have*

$$\mathfrak{m}_{k,\beta}^{can}(\mathfrak{x},\cdots,\mathfrak{x}) = \frac{c_\beta}{k!}(\partial\beta \cap \mathfrak{x})^k \cdot PD([L(u)]).$$

Here $PD([L(u)])$ is the Poincaré dual to the fundamental class. In other words it is the n form with $\int_{L(u)} PD([L(u)]) = 1$.

Proof. It suffices to consider the case $\mathfrak{x} = \rho \in H^1(L(u);\mathbb{R})$, and show

$$\int_{L(u)} \mathfrak{m}_{k,\beta}^{can}(\rho,\cdots,\rho) = \frac{c_\beta}{k!}(\partial\beta \cap \mathfrak{x})^k. \tag{11.10}$$

Let

$$C_k = \{(t_1,\cdots,t_k) \mid 0 \le t_1 \le \cdots \le t_k \le 1\}. \tag{11.11}$$

We define an iterated blow-up, denoted by $\widehat{C}_k$, of C_k in the following way. Let $S = \partial D$ be the boundary of the unit disc $D = D^2 \subset \mathbb{C}$ and $\beta_D \in H_2(\mathbb{C},S)$ be the homology class of the unit disc. We consider the moduli space $\mathcal{M}_{k+1}(\mathbb{C},S;\beta_D)$ and the evaluation map $e\vec{v} = (ev_0,\cdots,ev_k) : \mathcal{M}_{k+1}(\mathbb{C},S;\beta_D) \to (S^1)^{k+1}$. We fix a point $p_0 \in S \subset \mathbb{C}$ and put

$$\widehat{C}_k := ev_0^{-1}(p_0) \subset \mathcal{M}_{k+1}(\mathbb{C},S;\beta_D).$$

We make the identification $S^1 \setminus \{p_0\} \cong (0,1)$. Then $e\vec{v}$ induces a diffeomorphism

$$\widehat{C}_k \cap \mathcal{M}_{k+1}^{\mathrm{reg}}(\mathbb{C},S;\beta_D) \to \mathrm{Int}\ C_k$$

given by

$$[w,z_0,\cdots,z_k] \mapsto (w(z_1)-w(z_0),\cdots,w(z_k)-w(z_0))$$

where

$$\mathrm{Int}\ C_k = \{(t_1,\cdots,t_k) \mid 0 < t_1 < \cdots < t_k < 1\} \subset C_k.$$

In this sense $\widehat{C}_k$ is regarded as an iterated blow up of C_k along the diagonal (that is the set of points where $t_i = t_{i+1}$ for some i). We identify $\partial D = S \cong \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \cong S^1$. We have

$$\mathcal{M}_{k+1}^{\mathrm{main}}(L(u),\beta)^{\mathfrak{s}} \cong \mathcal{M}_1^{\mathrm{main}}(L(u),\beta)^{\mathfrak{s}} \times \widehat{C}_k. \tag{11.12}$$

In fact, Corollary 11.5 implies $\mathcal{M}_1^{\mathrm{main}}(L(u),\beta)^{\mathfrak{s}}$ consists of finitely many free T^n orbits (with multiplicity $\in \mathbb{Q}$) and $\mathcal{M}_1^{\mathrm{main}}(L(u),\beta)^{\mathfrak{s}} = \mathcal{M}_1^{\mathrm{main,reg}}(L(u),\beta)^{\mathfrak{s}}$. By Lemma 11.2 (3) we have a map $\mathcal{M}_{k+1}^{\mathrm{main,reg}}(L(u),\beta)^{\mathfrak{s}} \to \mathcal{M}_1^{\mathrm{main,reg}}(L(u),\beta)^{\mathfrak{s}}$. It is easy to see that the fiber can be identified with $\widehat{C}_k$.

Under this identification, the evaluation map $e\vec{v}$ is induced by

$$ev_i(\mathfrak{u};t_1,\cdots,t_k) = [t_i\partial\beta] \cdot ev(\mathfrak{u}) \tag{11.13}$$

for $(\mathfrak{u};t_1,\cdots,t_k) \in \mathcal{M}_1^{\mathrm{main}}(L(u),\beta) \times \mathrm{Int}\ C_k \subset \mathcal{M}_1^{\mathrm{main}}(L(u),\beta) \times \widehat{C}_k$.

Here $\partial\beta \in H_1(L(u);\mathbb{Z})$ is identified to an element of the universal cover $\widetilde{L}(u) \cong \mathbb{R}^n$ of $L(u)$ and $[t_i\partial\beta] \in L(u)$ acts as a multiplication on the torus. $ev(\mathfrak{u})$ is defined by the evaluation map $ev : \mathcal{M}_1^{\text{main}}(L(u),\beta) \to L(u)$. We also have :

$$ev_0(\mathfrak{u}; t_1, \cdots, t_k) = ev(\mathfrak{u}). \tag{11.14}$$

We remark that $ev : \mathcal{M}_1^{\text{main}}(L(u),\beta_i) \to L(u)$ is a diffeomorphism (See Theorem 11.1 (3)). Now we have

$$\int_{L(u)} \mathfrak{m}_{k,\beta}^{dR}(\rho,\cdots,\rho) = c_\beta \text{Vol}(C_k) \left(\int_{\partial\beta} \rho\right)^k = \frac{c_\beta}{k!}(\partial\beta \cap \mathfrak{x})^k.$$

The proof of Lemma 11.8 is now complete. □

Remark 11.9. We can prove that our filtered A_∞ algebra $(H(L(u);\Lambda_0^{\mathbb{R}}), \mathfrak{m}_*^{can})$ is homotopy equivalent to the one in [FOOO3] Theorem A (= [FOOO2] Theorem A). The proof is a straight forward generalization of section 7.5 [FOOO3] (= section 33 of [FOOO2]) and is omitted here. In fact we do not need to use this fact to prove Theorem 1.5 if we use de Rham version in all the steps of the proof of Theorem 1.5 without involving the singular homology version.

Remark 11.10. We constructed our filtered A_∞ structure directly on de Rham cohomology group $H(L(u);\Lambda_0^{\mathbb{R}})$. The above construction uses the fact that wedge product of harmonic forms are again harmonic. This is a special feature of our situation where our Lagrangian submanifold L is a torus. (In other words we use the fact that rational homotopy type of L is formal.)

Alternatively we can construct filtered A_∞ structure on the de Rham complex $\Omega(L(u))\widehat{\otimes}_{\mathbb{R}}\Lambda_0^{\mathbb{R}}$ and reduce it to the de Rham cohomology by homological algebra. Namely we consider smooth forms ρ_i which are not necessarily harmonic and use (11.6) and (11.9) to define $\mathfrak{m}_k^{dR}(\rho_1,\cdots,\rho_k)$. (The proof of A_∞ formula is the same.) Using the formality of T^n, we can show that the canonical model of $(\Omega(L(u))\widehat{\otimes}_{\mathbb{R}}\Lambda_0^{\mathbb{R}}, \mathfrak{m}_*^{dR})$ is the same as $(H(L(u);\Lambda_0^{\mathbb{R}}), \mathfrak{m}^{can})$. We omit its proof since we do not use it.

Using the continuous family of perturbations, this construction can be generalized to the case of arbitrary relatively spin Lagrangian submanifold in a symplectic manifold. See [Fu5].

Proof of Proposition 4.3. Proposition 4.3 immediately follows from Corollary 11.5, Lemma 11.8 and Lemma 11.9 : We just take the sum

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k=0}^\infty \mathfrak{m}_k^{can}(b,\cdots,b) &= \sum_{k=0}^\infty \sum_{\beta\in\pi_2(X,L(u))} T^{\omega\cap\beta/2\pi}\mathfrak{m}_{k,\beta}^{can}(b,\cdots,b) \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^\infty \sum_\beta T^{\omega\cap\beta/2\pi}\mathfrak{m}_{k,\beta}^{can}(b,\cdots,b) \\
&= \sum_\beta \sum_{k=0}^\infty \frac{c_\beta}{k!}(\partial\beta\cap b)^k T^{\beta\cap\omega/2\pi}\cdot PD([L(u)]). \qquad (11.15)
\end{aligned}$$

Note, by the degree reason, we need to take sum over β with $\mu(\beta) = 2$.

Since b is assumed to lie in $H^1(L(u),\Lambda_+)$ not just in $H^1(L(u),\Lambda_0)$, the series appearing as the scalar factor in (11.15) converges in non-Archimedean topology of Λ_0 and so the sum $\sum_{k=0}^\infty \mathfrak{m}_k^{can}(b,\cdots,b)$ is a multiple of $PD([L(u)])$. Hence

$b \in \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{\mathrm{weak}}(L(u))$ by definition (4.1). We remark that the gauge equivalence relation in Chapter 4 [FOOO3] is trivial on $H^1(L(u);\Lambda_0)$ and so $H^1(L(u);\Lambda_+) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{weak}}(L(u))$. We omit the proof of this fact since we do not use it in this paper. □

Proof of Theorem 4.5. Suppose that there is no nontrivial holomorphic sphere whose Maslov index is nonpositive. Then Theorem 11.1 (5) implies that if $\mu(\beta) \leq 2$, $\beta \neq \beta_i$, $\beta \neq 0$ then $\mathcal{M}_1^{\mathrm{main}}(L(u),\beta)$ is empty. Therefore again by dimension counting as in Corollary 11.5, we obtain

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathfrak{m}_k^{dR,can}(x,\cdots,x) = \sum_{i=1}^{m}\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} T^{\omega\cap\beta_i/2\pi}\mathfrak{m}_{k,\beta_i}^{dR,can}(x,\cdots,x)$$

for $x \in H^1(L(u),\Lambda_+)$. On the other hand, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{PO}(x;u) &= \sum_{i=1}^{m}\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\frac{1}{k!}(\partial\beta_i\cap x)^k T^{\ell_i(u)} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{m}\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\frac{1}{k!}\langle v_i,x\rangle^k T^{\ell_i(u)} = \sum_{i=1}^{m} e^{\langle v_i,x\rangle}T^{\ell_i(u)}\end{aligned}$$

from (6.8), (11.15) and the definition of $\mathfrak{PO}$. Writing $x = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i\mathbf{e}_i$ and recalling $y_i = e^{x_i}$, we obtain $e^{\langle v_i,x\rangle} = y_1^{v_{i,1}}\cdots y_n^{v_{i,n}}$ and hence the proof of Theorem 4.5. □

Proof of Theorem 4.6. Let $\beta \in \pi_2(X)$, $\mu(\beta) = 2$ and $\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{weak}}(\beta) \neq \emptyset$. Theorem 11.1 (5) implies that

$$\partial\beta = \sum k_i\partial\beta_i, \quad \beta = \sum_i k_i\beta_i + \sum_j \alpha_j.$$

Hence

$$\sum_k T^{\beta\cap\omega/2\pi}\mathfrak{m}_{k,\beta}^{can}(b,\cdots,b)$$

becomes one of the terms of the right hand side of (4.7). We remark that class β with $\mu(\beta) \geq 4$ does not contribute to $\mathfrak{m}_k^{can}(b,\cdots,b)$ by the degree reason.

When all the vertices of P lie in $\mathbb{Q}^n$, then the symplectic volume of all α_j are in $2\pi\mathbb{Q}$. Moreover $\omega\cap\beta_i \in 2\pi\mathbb{Q}$. Therefore the exponents $\beta\cap\omega/2\pi$ are rational.

The proof of Theorem 4.6 is complete. □

Remark 11.11. We remark that in Lemma 11.2 we constructed a system of multisections only for $\mathcal{M}_{k+1}^{\mathrm{main}}(L(u),\beta)$ with $\beta\cap\omega < E$. So we obtain only an $A_{n,K}$ structure instead of a filtered A_∞ structure. Here $(n,K) = (n(E),K(E))$ depends on E and $\lim_{E\to\infty}(n(E),K(E)) = (\infty,\infty)$. It induces an $A_{n,K}$ structure $\mathfrak{m}^{(E)}$ on $H(L;\Lambda_0)$. (See subsection 7.2.7 [FOOO3] = subsection 30.7 [FOOO2].) In the same way as section 7.2 [FOOO3] (= section 30 [FOOO2]), we can find $(n'(E),K'(E))$ such that $(n'(E),K'(n)) \to (\infty,\infty)$ as $E\to\infty$ and the following holds.

If $E_1 < E_2$ then $A_{n(E_1),K(E_1)}$ structure $\mathfrak{m}^{(E_1)}$ is $(n'(E),K'(E))$-homotopy equivalent to $\mathfrak{m}^{(E_2)}$.

This implies that we can extend $\mathfrak{m}^{(E_1)}$ (regarded as $A_{n'(E_1),K'(E_1)}$ structure) to a filtered A_∞ structure by Theorem 7.2.72 [FOOO3] (= Theorem 30.72 [FOOO2]). (We also remark that for all the applications in this paper we can use filtered $A_{n,K}$ structure for sufficiently large n,K, in place of filtered A_∞ structure.)

Moreover we can use Lemma 11.7 to show the following. If $\mathfrak{x}_i \in H^1(L(u);\mathbb{Q})$ then $\mathfrak{m}_{k,\beta}^{(E)}(\mathfrak{x}_1,\cdots,\mathfrak{x}_k)$ is independent of E. So in particular it coincides to one of filtered A_∞ structure we define as above.

In other words, since the number c_β is independent of the choice of the system of T^n invariant multisections it follows that the potential function in Theorem 4.6 is independent of it. However we do not know how to calculate it.

Remark 11.12. We used de Rham cohomology to go around the problem of transversality among chains in the classical cup product. One drawback of this approach is that we lose control of the rational homotopy type. Namely we do *not* prove here that the filtered A_∞ algebra (partially) calculated above is homotopy equivalent to the one in Theorem A [FOOO3] (= Theorem A [FOOO2]) over $\mathbb{Q}$. (Note all the operations we obtain is defined over $\mathbb{Q}$, however.) We however believe that they are indeed homotopy equivalent over $\mathbb{Q}$. There may be several possible ways to prove this statement, one of which is to use the rational de Rham forms used by Sullivan.

Moreover since the number c_β is independent of the choices we made, the structure of filtered A_∞ algebra on $H(L(u),\Lambda^{\mathbb{Q}})$ is well defined, that is independent of the choices involved. The $\mathbb{Q}$-structure is actually interesting in our situation. See for example Proposition 7.13. However homotopy equivalence of the $\mathbb{Q}$-version of Lemma 11.9 is not used in the statement of Proposition 7.13 or in its proof.

12. Non-unitary flat connection on $L(u)$

In this section we explain how we can include (not necessarily unitary) flat bundles on Lagrangian submanifolds in Lagrangian Floer theory following [Fu3], [Cho].

Remark 12.1. We need to use flat complex line bundle for our purpose by the following reason. In [FOOO3] we assumed that our bounding cochain b is an element of $H(L;\Lambda_+)$ since we want the series

$$\mathfrak{m}_1^b(x) = \sum_{k,\ell} \mathfrak{m}_{k+\ell+1}(b^{\otimes k}, x, b^{\otimes \ell})$$

to converge. There we used convergence with respect to the non-Archimedean norm. For the case of Lagrangian fibers in toric manifold, the above series converges for $b \in H^1(L;\Lambda_0)$. The convergence is the usual (classical Archimedean) topology on $\mathbb{C}$ on each coefficient of T^λ.

This is not an accident and was expected to happen in general. (See Conjecture 3.6.46 [FOOO3] = Conjecture 11.46 [FOOO2].) However for this convergence to occur, we need to choose the perturbations on $\mathcal{M}_{k+1}^{\mathrm{main}}(L,\beta)$ so that it is consistent with $\mathcal{M}_{k'+1}^{\mathrm{main}}(L,\beta)$ $(k' \neq k)$ via the forgetful map. We can make this choice for the current toric situation by Lemma 11.2 (3). In a more general situation, we need to regard $\mathcal{M}_1^{\mathrm{main}}(L,\beta)$ as a chain in the free loop space. (See [Fu4].)

On the other hand, if we use the complex structure other than the standard one, we do not know whether Lemma 11.2 (3) holds or not. So in the proof of independence of Floer cohomology under the various choices made, there is a trouble to use a bounding cochain b lying in $H^1(L;\Lambda_0)$. The idea, which is originally due to Cho [Cho], is to change the leading order term of $\mathfrak{x}$ by twisting the construction using *non-unitary* flat bundles on L.

Let X be a symplectic manifold and L be its relatively spin Lagrangian submanifold. Let $\rho : H_1(L;\mathbb{Z}) \to \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ be a representation and $\mathfrak{L}_\rho$ be the flat $\mathbb{C}$ bundle induced by ρ.

We replace the formula (11.9) by

$$\mathfrak{m}_k^{\rho,can} = \sum_{\beta \in H_2(M,L)} \rho(\partial\beta)\ \mathfrak{m}_{k,\beta}^{can} \otimes T^{\omega(\beta)/2\pi}.$$

(Compare this with (4.3) in section 4.)

Proposition 12.2. $(H(L(u);\Lambda_0^{\mathbb{R}}), \mathfrak{m}_k^{\rho,can})$ *is a filtered* A_∞ *algebra.*

Proof. Suppose that $[f] \in \mathcal{M}_{k+1}^{\mathrm{main}}(L,\beta)$ is a fiber product of $[f_1] \in \mathcal{M}_{\ell+1}^{\mathrm{main}}(L,\beta_1)$ and $[f_2] \in \mathcal{M}_{k-\ell}^{\mathrm{main}}(L,\beta_2)$. Namely $\beta_1 + \beta_2 = \beta$ and $ev_0(f_2) = ev_i(f_1)$ for some i. Then it is easy to see that

$$\rho(\partial\beta) = \rho(\partial\beta_1)\rho(\partial\beta_2). \tag{12.1}$$

(12.1) and (11.8) imply the filtered A_∞ relation. □

The unitality can also be proved in the same way. The well definedness (that is, independence of various choices up to homotopy equivalence) can also be proved in the same way.

Remark 12.3. We have obtained our twisted filtered A_∞ structure on the (untwisted) cohomology group $H^*(L;\Lambda_0)$. This is because the flat bundle $Hom(\mathfrak{L}_\rho, \mathfrak{L}_\rho)$ is trivial. In more general situation where we consider a flat bundle $\mathfrak{L}$ of higher rank, we obtain a filtered A_∞ structure on cohomology group with local coefficients with values in $Hom(\mathfrak{L},\mathfrak{L})$.

The filtered A_∞ structure $\mathfrak{m}_k^{\rho,can}$ is different from $\mathfrak{m}_k^{can}$ in general as we can see from the expression of the potential function given in Lemma 4.9.

In the rest of this section, we explain the way how the Floer cohomology detects the Lagrangian intersection. Namely we sketch the proof of Theorem 3.11 in our case and its generalization to the case where we include the nonunital flat connection ρ.

Let $\psi_t : X \to X$ be a Hamiltonian isotopy with $\psi_0 =$ identity. We put $\psi_1 = \psi$. We consider the pair

$$L^{(0)} = L(u), \quad L^{(1)} = \psi(L(u))$$

such that $L^{(1)}$ is transversal to $L^{(0)}$. We then take a one-parameter family $\{J_t\}_{t\in[0,1]}$ of compatible almost complex structures such that $J_0 = J$ which is the standard complex structure of X and $J_1 = \psi_*(J)$.

Let $p, q \in L^{(0)} \cap L^{(1)}$. We consider the homotopy class of a maps

$$\varphi : \mathbb{R} \times [0,1] \to X \tag{12.2}$$

such that

(1) $\lim_{\tau\to-\infty} \varphi(\tau,t) = p$, $\lim_{\tau\to+\infty} \varphi(\tau,t) = q$.
(2) $\varphi(\tau,0) \in L^{(0)}$, $\varphi(\tau,1) \in L^{(1)}$.

We denote by $\pi_2(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, q)$ the set of all such homotopy classes. There are obvious maps

$$\begin{aligned}
&\pi_2(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, r) \times \pi_2(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; r, q) \to \pi_2(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, q),\\
&\pi_2(X; L^{(1)}) \times \pi_2(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, q) \to \pi_2(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, q),\\
&\pi_2(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, q) \times \pi_2(X; L^{(0)}) \to \pi_2(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, q).
\end{aligned} \tag{12.3}$$

We denote them by $\#$.

Definition 12.4. We consider the moduli space of maps (12.2) satisfying (1), (2) above, in homotopy class $B \in \pi_2(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, q)$, and satisfies the following equation :

$$\frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial \tau} + J_t \left(\frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial t} \right) = 0. \tag{12.4}$$

We denote it by $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathrm{reg}}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, q; B)$. We take its stable map compactification and denote it by $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, q; B)$. We divide this space by the $\mathbb{R}$ action induced by the translation of τ direction to obtain $\mathcal{M}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, q; B)$. We define evaluation maps $ev_{L^{(i)}} : \widehat{\mathcal{M}}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, q; B) \to L^{(i)}$ by $ev_{L^{(i)}}(\varphi) = \varphi(0, i)$, for $i = 0, 1$.

Lemma 12.5. *$\mathcal{M}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, q; B)$ has an oriented Kuranishi structure with corners. Its boundary is isomorphic to the union of the following three kinds of fiber products as spaces with Kuranishi structure.*

(1)
$$\mathcal{M}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, r; B') \times \mathcal{M}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; r, q; B'').$$
Here $B' \in \pi_2(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, r)$, $B'' \in \pi_2(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; r, q)$.

(2)
$$\mathcal{M}_1(L(u); \beta') \,{}_{ev_0}\times_{ev_{L^{(1)}}} \widehat{\mathcal{M}}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, q; B'').$$
Here $\beta' \in \pi_2(X; L^{(1)}) \cong \pi_2(X; L(u))$, $\beta' \# B'' = B$. The fiber product is taken over $L^{(1)} \cong L(u)$ by using $ev_0 : \mathcal{M}(L(u); \beta') \to L(u)$ and $ev_{L^{(1)}} : \widehat{\mathcal{M}}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, q; B'') \to L^{(1)}$.

(3)
$$\widehat{\mathcal{M}}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, q; B') \,{}_{ev_{L^{(0)}}}\times_{ev_0} \mathcal{M}(L(u); \beta'').$$
Here $\beta' \in \pi_2(X; L^{(1)}) \cong \pi_2(X; L(u))$, $B' \# \beta'' = B$. The fiber product is taken over $L^{(0)} \cong L(u)$ by using $ev_0 : \mathcal{M}(L(u); \beta'') \to L(u)$ and $ev_{L^{(0)}} : \widehat{\mathcal{M}}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, q; B') \to L^{(0)}$.

We have
$$\dim \mathcal{M}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, q; B) = \mu(B) - 1$$
where
$$\begin{aligned}
&\mu(B_1 \# B_2) = \mu(B_1) + \mu(B_2),\\
&\mu(\beta' \# B'') = \mu(\beta') + \mu(B''), \quad \mu(B' \# \beta'') = \mu(B') + \mu(\beta'').
\end{aligned}$$
Here the notations are as in (1), (2), (3) *above.*

Lemma 12.5 is proved in subsection 7.1.4 [FOOO3] (= section 29.4 [FOOO2]).

Lemma 12.6. *There exists a system of multisections on $\mathcal{M}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, q; B)$ such that*

(1) *It is transversal to* 0.

(2) *It is compatible at the boundaries described in Lemma 12.5. Here we pull back multisection of* $\mathcal{M}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, q; B)$ *to one on* $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, q; B)$ *and use the multisection in Lemma 11.2 on* $\mathcal{M}(L(u); \beta)$.

Proof. We can find such system of multisections inductively over $\int_B \omega$ by using the fact that $ev_0 : \mathcal{M}(L(u); \beta)^{\mathfrak{s}} \to L(u)$ is a submersion and Lemma 12.5 (1) is a direct product. □

In the case when $\mu(B) = 1$, we define

$$n(B) = \#\mathcal{M}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, q; B)^{\mathfrak{s}} \in \mathbb{Q}$$

that is the number of zeros of our multisection counted with sign and multiplicity. We use it to define Floer cohomology.

Let $CF(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)})$ be the free $\Lambda_{0,nov}$ module generated by $L^{(0)} \cap L^{(1)}$. We will define boundary operator on it.

Let $\rho_i : \pi_1(L^{(i)}) \to \mathbb{C}^*$ be the representation. We take harmonic 1 form $h_i \in H^1(L^{(i)}; \mathbb{C})$ such that

$$\rho_i(\gamma) = \exp\left(\int_\gamma h_i\right).$$

Let $b_{i,+} \in H^1(L^{(0)}; \Lambda_+) \subset \mathcal{M}(L^{(0)})$. An element $B \in \pi_2(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, q)$ induces a path $\partial_i : [0, 1] \to L^{(i)}$ joining p to q in $L^{(i)}$ for $i = 0, 1$. We define

$$C(B; (h_0, h_1), (b_{0,+}, b_{1,+})) = \exp\left(\int_{\partial_0 B} (h_0 + b_{0,+})\right) \exp\left(-\int_{\partial_1 B} (h_1 + b_{1,+})\right).$$

This is an element of $\Lambda_0 \setminus \Lambda_+$. It is easy to see that

$$\begin{aligned} &C(B_1 \# B_2; (h_0, h_1), (b_{0,+}, b_{1,+})) \\ &= C(B_1; (h_0, h_1), (b_{0,+}, b_{1,+}))\, C(B_2; (h_0, h_1), (b_{0,+}, b_{1,+})), \end{aligned} \tag{12.5}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &C(\beta' \# B''; (h_0, h_1), (b_{0,+}, b_{1,+})) \\ &= C(B''; (h_0, h_1), (b_{0,+}, b_{1,+})) \exp\left(\int_{\partial \beta'} h_1 + b_{0,+}\right). \end{aligned} \tag{12.6}$$

(Here B' and β'' are as in Lemma 12.5 (2).) Now we define

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle \delta_{(h_0,h_1),(b_{0,+},b_{1,+})}(p), q \rangle \\ &= \sum_{B \in \pi_2(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, q); \mu(B) = 1} n(B) C(B; (h_0, h_1), (b_{0,+}, b_{1,+})). \end{aligned} \tag{12.7}$$

For the case $h_1 = \psi_*(h_0)$, $b_{1,+} = \psi_*(b_+)$, $b_{0,+} = b_+$, we write $C(B; h_0, b_+)$ and δ^{h_0, b_+}, in place of $C(B; (h_0, h_1), (b_{0,+}, b_{1,+}))$ and $\delta_{(h_0,h_1),(b_{0,+},b_{1,+})}$, respectively.

Lemma 12.7.

$$\delta_{(h_0,h_1),(b_{0,+},b_{1,+})} \circ \delta_{(h_0,h_1),(b_{0,+},b_{1,+})} = (\mathfrak{PO}(b(1)) - \mathfrak{PO}(b(0))) \cdot id$$

where $b(i) = h_i + b_{i,+} \in H^1(L(u); \Lambda_0)$.

Proof. Let $p, q \in L^{(1)} \cap L^{(0)}$. We consider $B \in \pi_2(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, q)$ with $\mu(B) = 2$. We consider the boundary of $\mathcal{M}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, q; B)$. We put

$$\delta_B = \begin{cases} 1 & B \in \pi_2(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, q),\ p = q, \text{ and } B \text{ is the class of constant map,} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then using the classification of the boundary of $\mathcal{M}(L^{(1)}, L^{(0)}; p, q; B)$ in Lemma 12.5 we have the following equality :

$$0 = \sum_{r,B,B''} n(B')n(B'') + \sum_{\beta',B''} c_{\beta'}\delta_{B''} - \sum_{\beta'',B'} c_{\beta''}\delta_{B'}, \tag{12.8}$$

where the summention in the first, second, third terms of right hand side is taken over the set described in Lemma 12.5 (1), (2), (3), respectively, and c_β is defined in Definition 11.6.

We multiply (12.8) by $C(B; (h_0, h_1), (b_{0,+}, b_{1,+}))$ and calculate the right hand side by using Formulae (12.5), (12.6) and Lemma 11.8. It is easy to see that the first term gives

$$\langle \delta_{(h_0,h_1),(h_{0,+},b_{1,+})} \circ \delta_{(h_0,h_1),(b_{0,+},b_{1,+})}(p), q\rangle.$$

The second term is 0 if $p \neq q$, and is

$$\sum_\beta c_\beta \exp\left(\int_{\partial\beta} h_0 + b_{0,+}\right) = \mathfrak{PO}(b(0))$$

if $p = q$. The third term gives $\mathfrak{PO}(b(1)) \cdot id$ in a similar way. □

Definition 12.8. Let $b(0) = h_0 + b_+$ and $b(1) = \psi_*(b(0))$. We define

$$HF((L^{(0)}, b(0)), (L^{(1)}, b(1)); \Lambda_0) \cong \frac{\text{Ker } \delta_{h_0,h_+}}{\text{Im } \delta_{h_0,h_+}}.$$

This is well defined by Lemma 12.7 and by the identity $\mathfrak{PO}(\psi_*(b(0))) = \mathfrak{PO}((b(0)))$.

Now we have

Lemma 12.9.

$$HF((L^{(0)}, b(0)), (L^{(1)}, b(1)); \Lambda_0) \otimes_{\Lambda_0} \Lambda \cong \frac{\text{Ker } \mathfrak{m}_1^{\rho,can,b_+}}{\text{Im } \mathfrak{m}_1^{\rho,can,b_+}} \otimes_{\Lambda_0} \Lambda.$$

Here $\rho(\gamma) = \exp\left(\int_\gamma h_0\right)$ *and*

$$\mathfrak{m}_1^{\rho,can,b_+}(x) = \sum_{k_1,k_2=0}^{\infty} \mathfrak{m}_{k_1+k_2+1}^{\rho,can}(b_+^{\otimes k_1}, x, b_+^{\otimes k_2}).$$

Lemma 12.9 implies (the ρ twisted version of) Theorem 3.11 in our case. We omit the proof of Lemma 12.9 and refer section 5.3 [FOOO3] (= section 22 [FOOO2]) or section 8 [FOOO4].

13. Floer cohomology at a critical point of potential function

In this section we prove Theorem 4.10 etc. and complete the proof of Theorem 1.5.

Proof of Lemma 4.9. Let $\beta \in H_2(X, L(u_0))$ with $\mu(\beta) = 2$ and $\mathcal{M}_1^{\text{main}}(L(u_0), \beta)$ be nonempty. We have $\beta = \sum_{i=1}^m c_i\beta_i + \sum_j \alpha_j$ by Theorem 11.1 (5). Let ρ be as in (4.15). We have $\rho(\partial\beta) = \prod \rho(\partial\beta_i)^{c_i}$. Note $\partial\beta_i = \sum_j v_{i,j}\mathbf{e}_j^*$. Thus we have

$$\begin{cases} \rho(\partial\beta_i) = \mathfrak{y}_{1,0}^{v_{i,1}} \cdots \mathfrak{y}_{n,0}^{v_{i,n}}, \\ \rho(\partial\beta) = \displaystyle\prod_i \prod_j \mathfrak{y}_{j,0}^{c_i v_{i,j}}. \end{cases} \tag{13.1}$$

Therefore for $b \in H^1(L(u_0);\Lambda_+^{\mathbb{C}})$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\mathfrak{m}_{k,\beta}^{\rho,can}(b,\cdots,b) &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\mathfrak{y}_{1,0}^{v_{i,1}}\cdots\mathfrak{y}_{n,0}^{v_{i,n}}\mathfrak{m}_{k,\beta}^{can}(b,\cdots,b)\\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty}e^{\mathfrak{x}_{1,0}v_{i,1}}\cdots e^{\mathfrak{x}_{n,0}v_{i,n}}\frac{c_\beta}{k!}(b\cap\partial\beta)^k\cdot[PD(L)]\\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\mathfrak{m}_{k,\beta}^{can}\left(b+\sum_{j=1}^{n}\mathfrak{x}_{j,0}\mathbf{e}_j,\cdots,b+\sum_{j=1}^{n}\mathfrak{x}_{j,0}\mathbf{e}_j\right).\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, it follows from Theorems 4.5 and 4.6 that the left and the right sides of this identity correspond to those in Lemma 4.9 respectively. This finishes the proof of Lemma 4.9. □

Proof of Theorem 4.10. Let $x^+ = (x_1^+,\cdots,x_n^+)$, $x_1^+,\cdots,x_n^+ \in \Lambda_+$. We put

$$x(x^+) = \sum_i(\mathfrak{x}_{i,0}+x_i^+)\mathbf{e}_i,\quad b(x^+) = \sum_i x_i^+\mathbf{e}_i.$$

From Lemma 4.9 we derive

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{PO}_\rho^{u_0}(b(x^+)) &= \sum\mathfrak{m}_k^{\rho,can}(b(x^+),\cdots,b(x^+))\cap[L(u_0)]\\ &= \sum\mathfrak{m}_k^{can}(x(x^+),\cdots,x(x^+))\cap[L(u_0)] = \mathfrak{PO}^{u_0}(x(x^+)).\end{aligned}$$

Let $\mathfrak{x}$ be as in (4.13). Then we have

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i^+}\mathfrak{PO}_\rho^{u_0}(b(x^+))\Big|_{x(x^+)=\mathfrak{x}} = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i^+}\mathfrak{PO}^{u_0}(x(x^+))\Big|_{x(x^+)=\mathfrak{x}} = \frac{\partial\mathfrak{PO}^{u_0}}{\partial x_i}(\mathfrak{x}) = 0,$$

where the last equality follows from the assumption (4.12). (In case when (4.11) is assumed we have '$\equiv 0 \mod T^{\mathcal{N}}$' in place of '$=0$'.) On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i^+}\mathfrak{PO}_\rho^{u_0}(b(x^+))\Big|_{x(x^+)=\mathfrak{x}}\\ &\quad= \sum_k\sum_\ell\mathfrak{m}_k^{\rho,can}(b^{\otimes\ell},\mathbf{e}_i,b^{\otimes(k-\ell-1)})\cap[L(u_0)]\\ &\quad= \mathfrak{m}_1^{\rho,can,b}(\mathbf{e}_i)\cap[L(u_0)].\end{aligned}\tag{13.2}$$

Note here and hereafter we write b in place of $b(x^+)$ with $x(x^+) = \mathfrak{x}$. Namely $b = \mathfrak{x} - \sum\mathfrak{x}_{i,0}\mathbf{e}_i$.

Hence we obtain

$$\mathfrak{m}_1^{\rho,can,b}(\mathbf{e}_i)\begin{cases}=0 & \text{if (4.12) is satisfied}\\ \equiv 0 \mod T^{\mathcal{N}} & \text{if (4.11) is satisfied.}\end{cases}\tag{13.3}$$

We remark that by the degree reason $\mathfrak{m}_1^{\rho,can,b}(\mathbf{e}_i)$ is proportional to $PD[L(u_0)]$.

We next prove the vanishing of $\mathfrak{m}_1^{\rho,can,b}(\mathbf{f})$ for the classes $\mathbf{f}$ of higher degree. Namely we prove

Lemma 13.1. *For $\mathbf{f} \in H^*(L(u_0);\Lambda_0^{\mathbb{C}})$ we have :*

$$\mathfrak{m}_{1,\beta}^{\rho,can,b}(\mathbf{f})\begin{cases}=0 & \textit{if (4.12) is satisfied}\\ \equiv 0 \mod T^{\mathcal{N}} & \textit{if (4.11) is satisfied.}\end{cases}$$

Proof. Let $d = \deg \mathbf{f}$ and $2\ell = \mu(\beta)$. We say $(d,\ell) < (d',\ell')$ if $\ell < \ell'$ or $\ell = \ell'$, $d < d'$. We prove the lemma by upward induction on (d,ℓ). The case $d = 1$ is (13.3). We remark that $\mathfrak{m}_{k,\beta} = 0$ if $\mu(\beta) \leq 0$.

We assume that the lemma is proved for (d',ℓ') smaller than (d,ℓ) and will prove the case of (d,ℓ). Since the case $d = 1$ is already proved, we may assume that $d \geq 2$. Let $\mathbf{f} = \mathbf{f}_1 \cup \mathbf{f}_2$ where $\deg \mathbf{f}_i \geq 1$. By the A_∞-relation we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{m}_{1,\beta}^{\rho,can,b}(\mathbf{f}_1 \cup \mathbf{f}_2) = &\sum_{\beta_1+\beta_2=\beta} \pm \mathfrak{m}_{2,\beta_1}^{\rho,can,b}(\mathfrak{m}_{1,\beta_2}^{\rho,can,b}(\mathbf{f}_1), \mathbf{f}_2) \\ &+ \sum_{\beta_1+\beta_2=\beta} \pm \mathfrak{m}_{2,\beta_1}^{\rho,can,b}(\mathbf{f}_1, \mathfrak{m}_{1,\beta_2}(\mathbf{f}_2)) \\ &+ \sum_{\beta_1+\beta_2=\beta,\beta_2\neq 0} \pm \mathfrak{m}_{1,\beta_1}^{\rho,can,b}(\mathfrak{m}_{2,\beta_2}(\mathbf{f}_1, \mathbf{f}_2)).\end{aligned}$$

We remark that $\mathfrak{m}_{1,\beta_0}^{\rho,can,b} = 0$ since we are working on a canonical model.

The first two terms of the right hand side vanishes by the induction hypothesis since $\deg \mathbf{f}_i < \deg \mathbf{f}$ and $\mu(\beta_i) \leq \mu(\beta)$. The third term also vanishes since $\mu(\beta_1) < \mu(\beta)$. The proof of Lemma 13.1 is complete. □

Lemma 13.1 immediately implies Theorem 4.10. □

Proof of Proposition 5.4. Let us specialize to the case of 2 dimension. In case $\dim L(u_0) = 2$, we can prove $\mathfrak{m}_{1,\beta}^{\rho,can,b} = 0$ for $\mu(\beta) \geq 4$ also by dimension counting. We can use that to prove Proposition 5.4 in the same way as above. □

Proof of Proposition 4.12. Let ω_i, u_i, $\mathfrak{x}_{i,\mathcal{N}}$ be as in Definition 4.11. We assume $\psi : X \to X$ does not satisfy (4.19) or (4.20) and will deduce a contradiction. We use the same (time dependent) Hamiltonian as ψ to obtain $\psi_i : (X,\omega_i) \to (X,\omega_i)$. Take an integer $\mathcal{N}$ such that $\|\psi_i\| < 2\pi\mathcal{N}$ for large i. Then for sufficiently large i, $L(u_0^i)$ and ψ_i does not satisfy (4.19) or (4.20). In fact if $\psi(L(u_0)) \cap L(u_0) = \emptyset$ then for sufficiently large i, we have $\psi_i(L(u_0^i)) \cap L(u_0^i) = \emptyset$. If $\psi(L(u_0))$ is transversal to $L(u_0)$ and if (4.20) is not satisfied, then

$$\#(\psi(L(u_0)) \cap L(u_0)) \geq \#(\psi_{\varepsilon_i}(L(u_0^i)) \cap L(u_0^i)).$$

On the other hand, by Theorem 4.10 we have

$$HF((L(u_i),\mathfrak{x}_{i,k}),(L(u_i),\mathfrak{x}_{i,k});\Lambda_0^{\mathbb{C}}/(T^{\mathcal{N}})) \cong H(T^n;\Lambda_0^{\mathbb{C}}/(T^{\mathcal{N}})).$$

It follows from Universal Coefficient Theorem that

$$HF((L(u_i),\mathfrak{x}_{i,k}),(L(u_i),\mathfrak{x}_{i,k});\Lambda_0^{\mathbb{C}}) \cong \Lambda_0^{\oplus a} \oplus \bigoplus_{i=1}^{b} \Lambda_0/(T^{c(i)}) \tag{13.4}$$

such that $c(i) \geq \mathcal{N}$ and $a + 2b \geq 2^n$. This contradicts to Theorem J [FOOO3]. (In fact Theorem J [FOOO3] (= Theorem 3.12) and (13.4) imply that (4.19) and (4.20) hold for $L(u_i)$ and ψ_i with $\|\psi_i\| < 2\pi\mathcal{N}$.) Proposition 4.12 is proved. □

Proof of Theorem 5.11. The proof is the same as the proof of Proposition 4.12 above. □

Now we are ready to complete the proof of Theorem 1.5.

Proof of Theorem 1.5. In the case where the vertices of P are contained in $\mathbb{Q}^n$, Proposition 4.7 and Theorem 4.10 imply that $L(u_0)$ is balanced in the sense of Definition 4.11. Therefore Proposition 4.12 implies Theorem 1.5 in this case. If the leading term equation is strongly nondegenerate, Theorem 1.5 also follows from Theorem 4.10, Theorem 10.4 and Proposition 4.12.

We finally present an argument to remove the rationality assumption. In view of Lemma 4.12, it suffices to prove the following Proposition 13.2.

Proposition 13.2. *In the situation of Theorem 1.5, there exists u_0 such that $L(u_0)$ is a balanced Lagrangian fiber.*

Proof. Let $\pi : X \to P$ be as in Theorem 1.5. Let us consider s_k, S_k, P_k as in section 9. We obtain $u_0 \in P$ such that $\{u_0\} = P_K$. We will prove that $L(u_0)$ is balanced.

We perturb the Kähler form ω of X a bit so that we obtain ω'. Let P' be the corresponding moment polytope and $s_k^{\omega'}$, $S_k^{\omega'}$, $P_k^{\omega'}$, be the corresponding piecewise affine function, number, subset of $P_{\omega'}$ obtained for ω', $P_{\omega'}$ as in section 9.

Proposition 13.3. *We can choose ω_h so that ω_h is rational and $\lim_{h\to\infty} s_k^{\omega_h} = s_k$, $\lim_{h\to\infty} S_k^{\omega_h} = S_k$, $\lim_{h\to\infty} P_k^{\omega_h} = P_k$, $\dim P_k^{\omega_h} = \dim P_k$ for all k.*

Proof. We write $I_k^{\omega'}$ the set I_k defined in (9.7) section 9 for ω', P'. We will prove the following lemma. We remark that the set $\mathfrak{K}$ of T^n invariant Kähler structure ω' is regarded as an open set of an affine space defined on $\mathbb{Q}$ (that is the Kähler cone). We may regard $\mathfrak{K}$ as a moduli space of moment polytope as follows : We consider a polyhedron P' each of whose edges is parallel to a corresponding edge of P. Translation defines an $\mathbb{R}^n$ action on the set of such P'. The quotient space can be identified with $\mathfrak{K}$.

Lemma 13.4. *There exists a subset $\mathfrak{P}_k$ of $\mathfrak{K}$ which is a nonempty open subset of an affine subspace defined over $\mathbb{Q}$ such that any element $\omega' \in \mathfrak{P}_k$ has the following properties :*

(1) $\dim P_l^{\omega'} = \dim P_l^{\omega}$ *for* $l \le k$.
(2) $I_l^{\omega'} = I_l^{\omega}$ *for* $l \le k$.

Remark 13.5. In the case of Example 8.1, the set $P_k^{\omega'}$ etc. jumps at the point $\alpha = 1/3$ in the Kähler cone. Hence the set $\mathfrak{P}_k$ may have strictly smaller dimension than $\mathfrak{K}$.

Proof. Let $A_l^{\omega'}$ be the affine space defined in section 9. (We put ω' to specify the symplectic form.) We write ℓ_i^{ω}, $\ell_i^{\omega'}$ in place of ℓ_i to specify symplectic form and moment polytope. We remark that the linear part of ℓ_i^{ω} is equal to the linear part of $\ell_i^{\omega'}$.

The proof of Lemma 13.4 is by induction on k. Let us first consider the case $k = 1$. We put

$$\widehat{A}_1^{\omega'} = \{u \in M_{\mathbb{R}} \mid \ell_{1,1}^{\omega'}(u) = \cdots = \ell_{1,a_1}^{\omega'}(u)\}.$$

We remark that $\{\ell_{1,1}^{\omega}, \cdots, \ell_{1,a_1}^{\omega}\} = I_1^{\omega}$ and so $\widehat{A}_1^{\omega} = A_1^{\omega}$.

We put

$$\mathfrak{P}'_1 = \{\omega' \mid \dim \widehat{A}_1^{\omega'} = \dim A_1^{\omega}\}.$$

It is easy to see that $\mathfrak{P}'_1$ is a nonempty affine subset of $\mathfrak{K}$ and is defined over $\mathbb{Q}$.

Sublemma 13.6. *If $\omega' \in \mathfrak{P}'_1$ and is sufficiently close to ω, then $P_1^{\omega'}$ is an equidimensional polyhedron in $\widehat{A}_1^{\omega'}$. In particular $\widehat{A}_1^{\omega'} = A_1^{\omega'}$.*

Proof. The tangent space of $\widehat{A}_1^{\omega'}$ is parallel to the tangent space of A_1^{ω}. Therefore $\ell_{1,j}^{\omega'}$ is constant on $\widehat{A}_1^{\omega'}$. We put

$$\widehat{S}_1^{\omega'} = \ell_{1,1}^{\omega'}(u)$$

for some $u \in \widehat{A}_1^{\omega'}$.

On the other hand, if $\ell_i^{\omega} \notin I_1^{\omega}$ then $\ell_i^{\omega}(u) > S_1^{\omega}$ on $\operatorname{Int} P_1^{\omega}$. Therefore if ω' is sufficiently close to ω we have $\ell_i^{\omega'}(u) > \widehat{S}_1^{\omega'}$ on a neighborhood of a compact subset of Int P_1^{ω}, which we identify with a subset of P'. This implies the sublemma. □

The Condition (1), (2) of Lemma 13.3 in the case $k = 1$ follows from Sublemma 13.6 easily.

Let us assume that Lemma 13.4 is proved up to $k-1$. We remark $\{\ell_{k,1}^{\omega}, \cdots, \ell_{k,a_k}^{\omega}\} = I_k^{\omega}$. We put

$$\widehat{A}_k^{\omega'} = \{u \in A_{k-1}^{\omega'} \mid \ell_{k,1}^{\omega'}(u) = \cdots = \ell_{k,a_k}^{\omega'}(u)\}$$

and

$$\mathfrak{P}'_k = \{\omega' \in \mathfrak{P}'_{k-1} \mid \dim \widehat{A}_k^{\omega'} = \dim A_k^{\omega}\}.$$

$\mathfrak{P}'_k$ is a nonempty affine subset of $\mathfrak{K}$ and is defined over $\mathbb{Q}$. We can show that a sufficiently small open neighborhood $\mathfrak{P}_k$ of ω in $\mathfrak{P}'_k$ has the required properties in the same way as the first step of the induction. The proof of Lemma 13.4 is complete. □

Proposition 13.3 follows immediately from Lemma 13.4. In fact the set of rational points are dense in $\mathfrak{P}_K$. □

Proposition 13.2 follows from Proposition 13.3, Proposition 4.7 and Theorem 4.10. □

The proof of Theorem 1.5 is now complete. □

Proof of Proposition 10.8. The proof is similar to the proof of Proposition 13.3. Let I_k be as in (10.2). We write it as $I_k(P, u_0)$, where P is the moment polytope of (X, ω). We define $I_k(P', u'_0)$ as follows.

Let P' be a polytope which is a small perturbation of P and such that each of the faces are parallel to the corresponding face of P. Let $u'_0 \in \operatorname{Int} P'$. Let us consider the set $\mathfrak{K}^+$ of all such pairs (P', u'_0). It is an open set of an affine space defined over $\mathbb{Q}$. Each of such P' is a moment polytope of certain Kähler form on X. (We remark that Kähler form on X determine P' only up to translation.)

For each P', we take corresponding Kähler form on X and it determines a potential function. Therefore $I_k(P', u'_0)$ is determined by (10.2). We define $A_l^{\perp}(P', u'_0)$ in the same way as Definition 10.1.

Lemma 13.7. *There exists a subset $\mathfrak{Q}_k$ of $\mathfrak{K}^+$ which is a nonempty open set of an affine subspace defined over $\mathbb{Q}$. All the elements (P', u'_0) of $\mathfrak{Q}_k$ have the following properties.*

(1) $\dim A_l^{\perp}(P', u'_0) = \dim A_l^{\perp}(P, u_0)$ *for* $l \le k$.
(2) $I_l(P', u'_0) = I_l(P, u_0)$ *for* $l \le k$.

The proof is the same as the proof of Lemma 13.4 and is omitted.

Now we take a sequence of rational points $(P_h, u_0^h) \in \mathfrak{Q}_k$ converging to (P, u_0). Lemma 13.7 (2) implies that the leading term equation at u_0^h is the same as the leading term equation at u_0. The proof of Proposition 10.8 is complete. □

Proof of Lemma 10.5. Let $[\omega] \in H^2(X;\mathbb{Q})$. We may take the moment polytope P such that its vertices are rational. (This time we do not change P throughout the proof.) Let $u_0 \in \operatorname{Int} P$ and we assume that $\mathfrak{PO}_0^{u_0}$ has a nondegenerate critical point in $(\Lambda_0 \setminus \Lambda_+)^n$.

We define $I_k(P,u)$ as above. In the same way as the proof of Lemma 13.7 we can prove the following.

Sublemma 13.8. *The set $\mathcal{P}_k$ of all $u \in \operatorname{Int} P$ satisfying the following conditions* (1),(2) *contains an open neighborhoods u_0 in certain affine subspace A of $\mathbb{R}^n$. A is defined on $\mathbb{Q}$.*

(1) $\dim A_l^{\perp}(P,u) = \dim A_l^{\perp}(P,u_0)$ *for all* $l < k$.
(2) $I_l(P,u) = I_l(P,u_0)$ *for all* $l < k$.

We omit the proof. We take K such that $\{d\ell_i \mid \ell_i \in I_1(P,u_0) \cup \cdots \cup I_K(P,u_0)\}$ generates $N_{\mathbb{R}}$. (Note $P \subset N_{\mathbb{R}} = M_{\mathbb{R}}^*$.) By Sublemma 13.8 there exists a sequence $\{u_i\}_{i=1,2,\cdots}$ of rational points u_i in $\mathcal{P}_K$ which converges to u_0.

(1), (2) above implies $\mathfrak{PO}_0^{u_0}$ and $\mathfrak{PO}_0^{u_i}$ has the same leading term equation. Therefore by assumption $\mathfrak{PO}_0^{u_i}$ has a critical point on $(\Lambda_0\setminus\Lambda_+)^n$. Since $Jac(\mathfrak{PO}_0;\Lambda)$ is finite dimensional, it follows that we may take a subsequence u_{k_i} such that $u_{k_1} = u_{k_2} = \cdots$. Hence $u_0 = u_{k_i}$, is rational as required. □

Remark 13.9. We can replace Definition 4.11 (3) by

$$HF((L(u_i),\mathfrak{x}_{i,\mathcal{N}}),(L(u_i),\mathfrak{x}_{i,\mathcal{N}});\Lambda^{\mathbb{C}}/(T^{\mathcal{N}})) \supseteq \Lambda^{\mathbb{C}}/(T^{\mathcal{N}}).$$

In fact the following three conditions are equivalent to one another :

(1) $HF((L(u),\mathfrak{x}),(L(u),\mathfrak{x});\Lambda^{\mathbb{C}}/(T^{\mathcal{N}})) \cong H(T^n;\mathbb{C}) \otimes \Lambda^{\mathbb{C}}/(T^{\mathcal{N}})$.
(2) $HF((L(u),\mathfrak{x}),(L(u),\mathfrak{x});\Lambda^{\mathbb{C}}/(T^{\mathcal{N}})) \supseteq \Lambda^{\mathbb{C}}/(T^{\mathcal{N}})$.
(3) $\frac{\partial \mathfrak{PO}^u}{\partial y_k} \equiv 0, \mod T^{\mathcal{N}} \qquad k = 1,\cdots,n,$ at $\mathfrak{x}$.

(1) ⇒ (2) is obvious. (3) ⇒ (1) is Theorem 4.10. Let us prove (2) ⇒ (3). Suppose (3) does not hold. We put $\frac{\partial \mathfrak{PO}^u}{\partial y_k} \equiv cT^{\lambda} \mod T^{\lambda}\Lambda_+$, where $c \in \mathbb{C}\setminus\{0\}$ and $0 \le \lambda < N$. Then (13.2) implies $T^{\mathcal{N}-\lambda}PD[L(u)] = 0$ in $HF((L(u),\mathfrak{x}),(L(u),\mathfrak{x});\Lambda^{\mathbb{C}}/(T^{\mathcal{N}}))$. Since $PD[L(u)]$ is a unit, (2) does not hold.

Remark 13.10. The proof of Theorem 4.10 (or of Lemma 13.1) does *not* imply

$$\mathfrak{m}_{k,\beta}(\rho_1,\cdots,\rho_k) = 0 \tag{13.5}$$

for $\mu(\beta) \ge 4$. So it does not imply that the numbers c_β (Definition 11.6) determine the filtered A_∞ algebra $(H(L(u);\Lambda_0),\mathfrak{m})$ up to homotopy equivalence. We however believe that this is indeed the case. In fact the homology group $H(\mathcal{L}(T^n);\mathbb{Q})$ of the free loop space $\mathcal{L}(T^n)$ is trivial of degree $> n$. On the other hand, $\dim \mathcal{M}_1^{\text{main}}(L(u_0);\beta) = n + \mu(\beta) - 2$. Hence if $\mu(\beta) \ge 4$ there is no nonzero homology class on the corresponding degree in the free loop space. Using the argument of [Fu4] it may imply that the contribution of those classes to the homotopy type of filtered A_∞ structure is automatically determined from the contribution of the classes of Maslov index 2.

On the other hand, pseudo-holomorphic disc with Maslov index ≥ 4 certainly contributes to the operator $\mathfrak{q}_{\ell,k,\beta}$ introduced in section 3.8 [FOOO3] (= section 13 [FOOO2]) : Namely $\mathfrak{q}_{\ell,k,\beta}$ is the operator that involves a cohomology class of the ambient symplectic manifold X. (See Remark 6.15) It seems that tropical geometry will play a role in this calculation.

14. Appendix 1 : Algebraically closedness of Novikov fields

Lemma 14.1. *If F is an algebraically closed field of characteristic 0, then Λ^F is algebraically closed.*

Proof. Let $\sum_{k=0}^n a_k x^k = 0$ be a polynomial equation with Λ^F coefficients. We will prove that it has a solution in Λ^F by induction on n. We may assume that $a_n = 1$. Replacing x by $x - \frac{a_{n-1}}{n}$ we may assume $a_{n-1} = 0$. (Here we use the fact that the characteristic of F is 0.) We may assume furthermore $a_0 \neq 0$, since otherwise 0 is a solution. We put

$$c = \inf_{k=0,\cdots,n-2} \frac{\mathfrak{v}_T(a_k)}{n-k}.$$

We put $x = T^c y$, $b_k = T^{c(k-n)} a_k$. Then our equation is equivalent to $P(y) = \sum_{k=0}^n b_k y^k = 0$. We remark that $b_n = 1$, $b_{n-1} = 0$, $b_0 \neq 0$. Moreover

$$\mathfrak{v}_T(b_k) = c(k-n) + \mathfrak{v}_T(a_k) \geq 0.$$

Namely $b_k \in \Lambda_0$. We define $\overline{b}_k \in F$ to be the zero order term of b_k i.e., to satisfy $b_k \equiv \overline{b}_k \mod \Lambda_+$. We consider the equation $\overline{P}(\overline{y}) = \sum_{k=0}^n \overline{b}_k \overline{y}^k = 0$. By our choice of c there exists $k < n-1$ such that $\overline{b}_k \neq 0$ and $\overline{b}_n = 1$, $\overline{b}_{n-1} = 0$. Therefore $\overline{P}$ has at least two roots. (We use the fact that the characteristic of F is 0 here.) Since F is algebraically closed we can decompose $\overline{P} = \overline{QR}$ where $\overline{Q}$ and $\overline{R}$ are monic, of nonzero degree and coprime. Therefore by Hensel's lemma, there exists $Q, R \in \Lambda_0[y]$ such that $P = QR$ and $\deg Q = \deg \overline{Q}$, $Q \equiv \overline{Q} \mod \Lambda_+$, $R \equiv \overline{R} \mod \Lambda_+$[3].

Since the degree of Q is smaller than the degree of P, it follows from induction hypothesis that Q has a root in Λ^F. The proof of Lemma 14.1 is now complete. □

By a similar argument we can show that if F is characteristic 0 then a finite algebraic extension of Λ^F is contained in Λ^K for some finite extension K of F. (We used this fact in section 7.)

Proof of Lemma 8.5. In view of the proof of Lemma 14.1, it suffices to show that Λ_0^{conv} is Henselian. (Namely Hensel's lemma holds for it.) Let

$$P(X) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} a_i X^i + X^n \in \Lambda_0^{conv}[X].$$

We assume that its $\mathbb{C}$-reduction $\overline{P} \in \mathbb{C}[X]$ is decomposed as $\overline{P} = \overline{QR}$, where $\overline{Q}$ and $\overline{R}$ are monic and coprime. We put

$$a_i = a_{i,0} + a_{i,+}, \qquad a_{i,0} \in \mathbb{C}, \quad a_{i,+} \in \Lambda_+^{conv},$$

and

$$\widetilde{P}(X) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} (a_{i,0} + Z_i) X^i + X^n \in \mathbb{C}[Z_0, \cdots, Z_{n-1}][X],$$

where Z_i are formal variables.

[3]A proof of Hensel's lemma, in the case when valuation is not necessarily discrete, is given, for example, in p 144 [BGR]. See also the proof of Lemma 8.5 given below.

The *convergent* power series ring $\mathbb{C}\{Z_0, \cdots, Z_{n-1}\}$ is Henselian (see section 45 [Na]). Therefore there exist monic polynomials $\widetilde{Q}, \widetilde{R} \in \mathbb{C}\{Z_0, \cdots, Z_{n-1}\}[X]$ such that

$$\widetilde{Q}\widetilde{R} = \widetilde{P}$$

and the $\mathbb{C}$-reduction of $\widetilde{Q}$, $\widetilde{R}$ are $\overline{Q}$, $\overline{R}$ respectively. On the other hand, it is easy to see that $Z_i \mapsto a_{i,+}$ induces a continuous ring homomorphism $\mathbb{C}\{Z_0, \cdots, Z_{n-1}\} \to \Lambda_0^{conv}$. Thus $\widetilde{Q}$, $\widetilde{R}$ induce $Q, R \in \Lambda_0^{conv}[X]$ such that $QR = P$. Hence Λ_0^{conv} is Henselian, as required. □

15. Appendix 2 : T^n-equivariant Kuranishi structure

In this section we define the notion of T^n equivariant Kuranishi structure and prove that our moduli space $\mathcal{M}_{k+1}^{\text{main}}(\beta)$ has one. We also show the existence of T^n equivariant perturbation of the Kuranishi map.

Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a compact space with Kuranishi structure. The space $\mathcal{M}$ is covered by a finite number of Kuranishi charts $(V_\alpha, E_\alpha, \Gamma_\alpha, \psi_\alpha, s_\alpha)$, $\alpha \in \mathfrak{A}$ which satisfy the following :

Condition 15.1. (1) V_α is a smooth manifold (with boundaries or corners) and Γ_α is a finite group acting effectively on V_α.

(2) $\text{pr}_\alpha : E_\alpha \to V_\alpha$ is a finite dimensional vector bundle on which Γ_α acts so that pr_α is Γ_α- equivariant.

(3) s_α is a Γ_α equivariant section of E_α.

(4) $\psi_\alpha : s_\alpha^{-1}(0)/\Gamma_\alpha \to \mathcal{M}$ is a homeomorphism to its image.

(5) The union of $\psi_\alpha(s_\alpha^{-1}(0)/\Gamma_\alpha)$ for various α is $\mathcal{M}$.

We assume that $\{(V_\alpha, E_\alpha, \Gamma_\alpha, \psi_\alpha, s_\alpha) \mid \alpha \in \mathfrak{A}\}$ is a good coordinate system, in the sense of Definition 6.1 [FO] or Lemma A1.11 [FOOO3] (= Lemma A1.11 [FOOO2]). This means the following : The set $\mathfrak{A}$ has a partial order $<$, where either $\alpha_1 \le \alpha_2$ or $\alpha_2 \le \alpha_1$ holds for $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathfrak{A}$ if

$$\psi_{\alpha_1}(s_{\alpha_1}^{-1}(0)/\Gamma_{\alpha_1}) \cap \psi_{\alpha_2}(s_{\alpha_2}^{-1}(0)/\Gamma_{\alpha_2}) \neq \emptyset.$$

Let $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathfrak{A}$ and $\alpha_1 \le \alpha_2$. Then, there exists a Γ_{α_1}-invariant open subset $V_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1} \subset V_{\alpha_1}$, a smooth embedding $\varphi_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1} : V_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1} \to V_{\alpha_2}$ and a bundle map $\widehat{\varphi}_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1} : E_{\alpha_1}|_{V_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}} \to E_{\alpha_2}$. which covers $\varphi_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}$. Moreover there exists an injective homomorphism $\widehat{\widehat{\varphi}}_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1} : \Gamma_{\alpha_1} \to \Gamma_{\alpha_2}$. We require that they satisfy the following

Condition 15.2. (1) The maps $\varphi_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}$, $\widehat{\varphi}_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}$ are $\widehat{\widehat{\varphi}}_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}$-equivariant.

(2) $\varphi_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}$ and $\widehat{\widehat{\varphi}}_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}$ induce an embedding of orbifold

$$\overline{\varphi}_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1} : \frac{V_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}}{\Gamma_{\alpha_1}} \to \frac{V_{\alpha_2}}{\Gamma_{\alpha_2}}. \tag{15.1}$$

(3) We have $s_{\alpha_2} \circ \varphi_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1} = \widehat{\varphi}_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1} \circ s_{\alpha_1}$.

(4) We have $\psi_{\alpha_2} \circ \overline{\varphi}_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1} = \psi_{\alpha_1}$ on $\frac{V_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1} \cap s_{\alpha_1}^{-1}(0)}{\Gamma_{\alpha_1}}$.

(5) If $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2 < \alpha_3$ then $\varphi_{\alpha_3,\alpha_2} \circ \varphi_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1} = \varphi_{\alpha_3,\alpha_1}$, on $\varphi_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}^{-1}(V_{\alpha_3,\alpha_2})$. $\widehat{\varphi}_{\alpha_3,\alpha_2} \circ \widehat{\varphi}_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1} = \widehat{\varphi}_{\alpha_3,\alpha_1}$, and

$$\widehat{\widehat{\varphi}}_{\alpha_3,\alpha_2} \circ \widehat{\widehat{\varphi}}_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1} = \widehat{\widehat{\varphi}}_{\alpha_3,\alpha_1},$$

hold in the similar sense.

(6) $V_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}/\Gamma_{\alpha_1}$ contains $\psi_{\alpha_1}^{-1}(\psi_{\alpha_1}(s_{\alpha_1}^{-1}(0)/\Gamma_{\alpha_1}) \cap \psi_{\alpha_2}(s_{\alpha_2}^{-1}(0)/\Gamma_{\alpha_2}))$.

Condition 15.3. $\mathcal{M}$ has a tangent bundle : i.e., the differential of s_{α_2} in the direction of the normal bundle induces a bundle isomorphism

$$ds_{\alpha_2} : \frac{\varphi^*_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1} TV_{\alpha_2}}{TV_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}} \to \frac{\widehat{\varphi}^*_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1} E_{\alpha_2}}{E_{\alpha_1}}.$$

We say $\mathcal{M}$ is oriented if V_α, E_α is oriented, the Γ_α action is orientation preserving, and ds_α is orientation preserving.

Definition 15.4. Suppose that $\mathcal{M}$ has a T^n action. We say our Kuranishi structure on $\mathcal{M}$ is T^n *equivariant in the strong sense* if the following holds :

(1) V_α has a T^n action which commutes with the given Γ_α action.
(2) E_α is a T^n equivariant bundle.
(3) The Kuranishi map s_α is T^n equivariant and ψ_α is a T^n equivariant map.
(4) The coordinate changes $\varphi_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}$ and $\varphi_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}$ are T^n equivariant.

Remark 15.5. We remark that Condition (1) above is more restrictive than the condition that the orbifold V_α/Γ_α has a T^n action. This is the reason why we use the phrase *in the strong sense* in the above definition. Hereafter we will say T^n equivariant instead for simplicity.

Let L be a smooth manifold. A strongly continuous smooth map $ev : \mathcal{M} \to L$ is a family of Γ_α invariant smooth maps

$$ev_\alpha : V_\alpha \to L \tag{15.2}$$

which induce $\overline{ev}_\alpha : V_\alpha/\Gamma_\alpha \to L$ such that $\overline{ev}_{\alpha_2} \circ \overline{\varphi}_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1} = \overline{ev}_{\alpha_1}$ on $V_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}/\Gamma_\alpha$. (Note Γ_α action on L is trivial.)

We say that ev is weakly submersive if each of ev_α in (15.2) is a submersion.

Definition 15.6. Assume that there exists T^n actions on L and $\mathcal{M}$. We say that $ev : \mathcal{M} \to L$ is T^n equivariant if ev_α in (15.2) is T^n equivariant.

Now we show

Proposition 15.7. *The moduli space $\mathcal{M}_{k+1}(\beta)$ has a T^n equivariant Kuranishi structure such that $ev_0 : \mathcal{M}_{k+1}(\beta) \to L$ is T^n equivariant strongly continuous weakly submersive map.*

Proof. Except the T^n equivariance this is proved in section 7.1 [FOOO3] (= section 29 [FOOO2]). Below we explain how we choose our Kuranishi structure so that it is T^n equivariant. We also include the case of the moduli space $\mathcal{M}_{k+1,\ell}(\beta)$ with interior marked points.

We first review the construction of the Kuranishi neighborhood from section 7.1 [FOOO3] (= section 29 [FOOO2]).

Let $\mathbf{x} = ((\Sigma, \vec{z}), w) \in \mathcal{M}_{k+1,\ell}(\beta)$. Let Σ_a be an irreducible component of Σ. We consider the operator

$$D_{w,a}\overline{\partial} : W^{1,p}(\Sigma_a; w^*(TX); L, \vec{z}_a) \to W^{0,p}(\Sigma_a; w^*(TX) \otimes \Lambda^{0,1}). \tag{15.3}$$

Here $W^{1,p}(\Sigma_a; w^*(TX); L, \vec{z}_a)$ is the space of section v of $w^*(TX)$ of $W^{1,p}$ class with the following properties.

(1) The restriction of v to $\partial\Sigma_a$ is in $w^*(TL)$.
(2) $\vec{z}_a$ is the set of Σ which is either singular or marked. We assume that v is 0 at those points.

$\Lambda^{0,1}$ is the bundle of $(0,1)$ forms on Σ_a and $W^{0,p}(\Sigma_a; w^*(TX) \otimes \Lambda^{0,1})$ is the set of sections of $W^{0,p}$ class of $w^*(TX) \otimes \Lambda^{0,1}$. $D_{w,a}\overline{\partial}$ is the linearization of (nonlinear) Cauchy-Riemann equation. (See [Fl].) The operator (15.3) is Fredholm by ellipticity thereof.

We choose open subsets W_a of Σ_a whose closure is disjoint from the boundary of each of the irreducible component Σ_a of Σ and from the singular points and marked points. By the unique continuation theorem, we can choose a finite dimensional subset $E_{0,a}$ of $C_0^\infty(W_a; w^*TX)$ (the set of smooth sections of compact support in W_a) such that

$$\mathrm{Im} D_{w,a}\overline{\partial} + E_{0,a} = W^{0,p}(\Sigma_a; w^*(TX) \otimes \Lambda^{0,1}).$$

When $\mathbf{x}$ has nontrivial automorphisms, we choose $\bigoplus_a E_{0,a}$ to be invariant under the automorphisms.

We next associate a finite dimensional subspace $E_{0,a}((\Sigma, \vec{z}), w')$ for w' which is 'C^0 close to w.' We need some care to handle the case where some component $(\Sigma_a, \vec{z}_a)$ is not stable, that is the case for which the automorphism group G_a of $(\Sigma_a, \vec{z}_a)$ is of positive dimension. (Note G_a is different from the automorphism group of $((\Sigma_a, \vec{z}_a), w|_{\Sigma_a})$. The latter group is finite.) We explain this choice of $E_{0,1}$ below following Appendix [FO].

For each unstable components Σ_a, pick points $z_{a,i} \in \Sigma$, $(i = 1, \cdots, d_a)$ with the following properties.

Condition 15.8. (1) w is immersed at $z_{a,i}$.
(2) $z_{a,i}$ in the interior of Σ_a, $z_{a,i} \neq z_{a,j}$ for $i \neq j$ and $z_{a,i} \notin \vec{z}$.
(3) $(\Sigma_a; (\vec{z} \cap \Sigma_a) \cup (z_{a,1}, \cdots, z_{a,d_a}))$ is stable.
(4) Let $\Gamma = \Gamma(\mathbf{x})$ be the group of automorphisms of $\mathbf{x} = ((\Sigma, \vec{z}), w)$. If $\gamma \in \Gamma$, $\gamma(\Sigma_a) = \Sigma_{a'}$ then $d_a = d_{a'}$ and $\{\gamma(z_{a,i}) \mid i = 1, \cdots, d_a\} = \{z_{a',i'} \mid i' = 1, \cdots, d_a\}$.

For each a, i we choose a submanifold $N_{a,i}$ of codimension 2 in X that transversely intersects with (Σ_a, w) at $w_a(z_{a,i})$. In relation to Condition 15.8 (4) above we choose $N_{a,i} = N_{a',i'}$ if $\gamma(z_{a,i}) = z_{a',i'}$.

We add extra interior marked points $\{z_{a,i} \mid a, i\}$ in addition to $\vec{z}$ on $(\Sigma, \vec{z})$, and obtain a stable curve $(\Sigma, \vec{z}^+)$. (Namely $\vec{z}^+ = \vec{z} \sqcup \{z_{a,i} \mid a, i\}$.) (We choose an order of the added marked points and fix it.)

We consider a neighborhood $\mathfrak{U}_0$ of $[\Sigma, \vec{z}^+]$ in $\mathcal{M}^{\mathrm{main}}_{k+1,\ell'}$, that is the moduli space of bordered stable curve of genus 0 with $k+1$ boundary and ℓ' interior marked points. Let Γ_0 be the group of automorphisms of $((\Sigma, \vec{z}^+), w)$. Now both Γ and Γ_0 are finite groups and $\Gamma \supseteq \Gamma_0$.

An element $\gamma \in \Gamma$ induces an automorphism $\gamma : \Sigma \to \Sigma$ which fixes marked points in $\vec{z}$ and permutes $\ell - \ell'$ marked points $\{z_{a,i} \mid a, i\}$, by Condition 15.8 (4). Therefore we obtain an element of $[\gamma_*(\Sigma, \vec{z}^+)]$ that is different from $[\Sigma, \vec{z}^+]$ only by reordering of marked points. We take the union of neighborhoods of $[\gamma_*(\Sigma, \vec{z}^+)]$ for various $\gamma \in \Gamma$ in $\mathcal{M}^{\mathrm{main}}_{k+1,\ell'}$ and denote it by $\mathfrak{U}$.

$\mathfrak{U}_0$ is written as $\mathfrak{V}_0/\Gamma_0$ where $\mathfrak{V}_0$ is a manifold. Moreover there exists a manifold $\mathfrak{V}$ on which Γ acts such that $\mathfrak{V}/\Gamma_0 = \mathfrak{U}$, $\mathfrak{V}/\Gamma \cong \mathfrak{U}_0$.

Furthermore there is a 'universal family' $\mathfrak{M} \to \mathfrak{V}$ where the fiber $\Sigma(\mathbf{v})$ of $\mathbf{v} \in \mathfrak{V}$ is identified with the bordered marked stable curve that represents the element $[\mathbf{v}] \in \mathfrak{V}/\Gamma \subset \mathcal{M}^{\mathrm{main}}_{k+1,\ell'}$. There is a Γ action on $\mathfrak{M}$ such that $\mathfrak{M} \to \mathfrak{V}$ is Γ equivariant.

By the construction, each member $\Sigma(\mathbf{v})$ of our universal family is diffeomorphic to Σ away from singularity. More precisely we have the following :

Let $\Sigma_0 = \Sigma \setminus S$ where S is a small neighborhood of the union of the singular point sets and the marked point sets. Then for each $\mathbf{v}$ there exists a smooth embedding $i_{\mathbf{v}} : \Sigma_0 \to \Sigma(\mathbf{v})$. The error of this embedding for becoming a biholomorphic map goes to 0 as $\mathbf{v}$ goes to 0. We may assume $\mathbf{v} \mapsto i_{\mathbf{v}}$ is Γ invariant in an obvious sense and $i_{\mathbf{v}}$ depends smoothly on $\mathbf{v}$.

We may choose W_a so that $W_a \subset \Sigma_0$ for each a. We moreover assume that $\bigoplus_a E_{0,a}$ is invariant under the Γ action in the following sense : if $\gamma \in \Gamma$ and $\Sigma_{a'} = \gamma(\Sigma_a)$ then the isomorphism induced by γ sends $E_{0,a}$ to $E_{0,a'}$.

Now we consider a pair $(w', \mathbf{v})$ where

$$w' : (\Sigma(\mathbf{v}), \partial\Sigma(\mathbf{v})) \to (X, L).$$

We assume :

Condition 15.9. There exists $\epsilon > 0$ depending only on $\mathbf{x}$ such that the following holds.

(1) $\sup_{x \in \Sigma_0} \operatorname{dist}(w'(i_{\mathbf{v}}(x)), w(x)) \leq \epsilon$.
(2) For any connected component D_c of $\Sigma(\mathbf{v}) \setminus \operatorname{Im}(i_{\mathbf{v}})$, the diameter of $w'(D_c)$ in X (with a fixed Riemannian metric on it) is smaller than ϵ.

For each point $x \in W_a$ we use the parallel transport to make the identification

$$T_{w(x)}X \otimes \Lambda^{0,1}_x(\Sigma) \equiv T_{w'(i_{\mathbf{v}}(x))}X \otimes \Lambda^{0,1}_{i_{\mathbf{v}}(x)}(\Sigma(\mathbf{v})).$$

Using this identification we obtain an embedding

$$I_{(\mathbf{v},w')} : \bigoplus_a E_{0,a} \longrightarrow w'^*(TX) \otimes \Lambda^{0,1}(\Sigma(\mathbf{v})).$$

Via this embedding $I_{(\mathbf{v},w')}$, we consider the equation

$$\overline{\partial} w' \equiv 0 \mod \bigoplus_a I_{(\mathbf{v},w')}(E_{0,a}), \tag{15.4}$$

together with the additional conditions

$$w'(z_{a,i}) \in N_{a,i}. \tag{15.5}$$

Let $V(\mathbf{x})$ be the set of solution of (15.4), (15.5). This is a smooth manifold (with boundary and corners) by the implicit function theorem and a gluing argument. (See [FOOO3] section A1.4 = [FOOO2] section A1.4 for the smoothness at boundary and corner.) Since we can make all the construction above invariant under the $\Gamma(\mathbf{x})$ action, the space $V(\mathbf{x})$ has a $\Gamma(\mathbf{x})$ action. (Note that we may choose $N_{a,i}$ so that $\{N_{a,i} \mid a, i\}$ is invariant under the action of $\Gamma(\mathbf{x})$.)

The obstruction bundle E is the space $\bigoplus_a E_{0,a}$ at $\mathbf{x}$ and $\bigoplus_a I_{(\mathbf{v},w')}(E_{0,a})$ at in $(\mathbf{v}, w')$.

We omit the construction of coordinate changes. See [FOOO3] section 7.1 (= [FOOO2] section 29) which in turn is similar to section 15 [FO].

The Kuranishi map is given by

$$((\Sigma', \vec{z}'), w') \mapsto \overline{\partial} w' \in \bigoplus_a E_{0,a}. \tag{15.6}$$

We have thus finished our review of the construction of Kuranishi charts.

Now we assume that X has a T^n action, which preserves both the complex and the symplectic structures on X. We also assume that L is a T^n orbit.

We want to construct a family of vector spaces $(\mathbf{v}, w') \mapsto \bigoplus_a I_{(\mathbf{v},w')}(E_{0,a})$ so that it is invariant under the T^n action. We need to slightly modify the above construction for this purpose. In fact it is not totally obvious to make the condition (15.5) T^n-invariant.

For this purpose we proceed in the following way. We fix a point $p_0 \in L$ and consider an element

$$\mathbf{x} \in ev_0^{-1}(p_0) \cap \mathcal{M}_{k+1,\ell}(\beta).$$

We are going to construct a T^n equivariant Kuranishi neighborhood of the T^n orbit of $\mathbf{x}$. Let $\mathbf{v} \in \mathfrak{V}$ and $w' : (\Sigma(\mathbf{v}), \partial\Sigma(\mathbf{v})) \to (X, L)$ be as before. We replace Condition 15.9 by the following.

Condition 15.10. Let z_0 be the 0-th boundary marked point and let $g \in T^n$ be the unique element satisfying $w'(z_0) = g(p_0)$. There exists $\epsilon > 0$ depending only on $\mathbf{x}$ such that the following holds.

(1) $\sup_{x\in\Sigma_0} \operatorname{dist}(w'(i_{\mathbf{v}}(x)), g(w(x))) \leq \epsilon$.
(2) For any connected component D_c of $\Sigma(\mathbf{v}) \setminus \operatorname{Im}(i_{\mathbf{v}})$, the diameter of $w'(D_c)$ in X (with a fixed Riemannian metric on it) is smaller than ϵ.

Now we define an embedding

$$I_{(\mathbf{v},w')} : \bigoplus_a E_{0,a} \longrightarrow w'^*(TX) \otimes \Lambda^{0,1}(\Sigma(\mathbf{v}))$$

as follows : We first use the g action to define an isomorphism

$$g_* : T_{w(x)}X \otimes \Lambda^{0,1}_x(\Sigma) \cong T_{g(w(x))}X \otimes \Lambda^{0,1}_x(\Sigma).$$

Then we use the parallel transport in the same way as before to define

$$\bigoplus_a g_*(E_{0,a}) \longrightarrow w'^*(TX) \otimes \Lambda^{0,1}(\Sigma(\mathbf{v})).$$

By composing the two we obtain the embedding $I_{(\mathbf{v},w')}$. Now we consider the equation

$$\overline{\partial} w' \equiv 0 \mod \bigoplus_a I_{(\mathbf{v},w')}(E_{0,a}), \tag{15.7}$$

together with the additional conditions

$$w'(z_{a,i}) \in g(N_{a,i}) \tag{15.8}$$

as before. Clearly these equations are T^n invariant. It is also $\Gamma(\mathbf{x})$ invariant.

Note the action of the automorphism group $\Gamma(\mathbf{x})$ of $\mathbf{x}$ of our Kuranishi structure, which is a finite group, acts on the source while T^n acts on the target. Therefore it is obvious that two actions commute.

By definition the obstruction bundle has a T^n action. Moreover (15.6) is T^n equivariant. It is fairly obvious from the construction that coordinate changes of the constructed Kuranishi structure is also T^n equivariant.

The proof of Proposition 15.7 is now complete. □

Remark 15.11. (1) From the above construction, it is easy to see that our T^n equivariant Kuranishi structure is compatible with the gluing at the boundary marked points. Namely under the embedding

$$\mathcal{M}_{k_1+1}(\beta_1)_{ev_0} \times_{ev_i} \mathcal{M}_{k_2+1}(\beta_2) \subset \mathcal{M}_{k_1+k_2}(\beta_1 + \beta_2)$$

the restriction of the Kuranishi structure of the right hand side coincides with the fiber product of the Kuranishi structure of the left hand side. More precisely speaking, we can construct the system of our Kuranishi structures so that this statement holds : this Kuranishi structure is constructed inductively over the number of disc components and the energy of β.

(2) On the other hand, when we construct the T^n invariant Kuranishi structure in the way we described above it may not be compatible with the gluing at the interior marked point. Namely by the embedding

$$\mathcal{M}_1(\alpha) \times_X \mathcal{M}_{k+1,1}(\beta) \subset \mathcal{M}_{k+1}(\beta + \alpha) \tag{15.9}$$

the restriction of the Kuranishi structure of the right hand sides may not coincide with the fiber product of the Kuranishi structure of the left hand side. This compatibility is not used in this paper and hence not required. See Remark 11.4 where similar point is discussed for the choice of multisections.

However contrary to the choice of multisections mentioned in Remark 11.4, we remark that it is possible to construct T^n equivariant Kuranishi structure compatible with (15.9). Since we do not use this point in the paper, we will not elaborate it here.

We next review on the multisections. (See section 3 [FO].) Let $(V_\alpha, E_\alpha, \Gamma_\alpha, \psi_\alpha, s_\alpha)$ be a Kuranishi chart of $\mathcal{M}$. For $x \in V_\alpha$ we consider the fiber $E_{\alpha,x}$ of the bundle E_α at x. We take its l copies and consider the direct product $E_{\alpha,x}^l$. We take the quotient thereof by the action of symmetric group of order $l!$ and let $\mathcal{S}^l(E_{\alpha,x})$ be the quotient space. There exists a map $tm_m : \mathcal{S}^l(E_{\alpha,x}) \to \mathcal{S}^{lm}(E_{\alpha,x})$, which sends $[a_1, \cdots, a_l]$ to $[\underbrace{a_1, \cdots, a_1}_{m \text{ copies}}, \cdots, \underbrace{a_l, \cdots, a_l}_{m \text{ copies}}]$. A smooth *multisection* s of the bundle $E_\alpha \to V_\alpha$ consists of an open covering $\bigcup_i U_i = V_\alpha$ and s_i which maps $x \in U_i$ to $s_i(x) \in \mathcal{S}^{l_i}(E_{\alpha,x})$. They are required to have the following properties :

Condition 15.12. (1) U_i is Γ_α-invariant. s_i is Γ_α-equivariant. (We remark that there exists an obvious map $\gamma : \mathcal{S}^{l_i}(E_{\alpha,x}) \to \mathcal{S}^{l_i}(E_{\alpha,\gamma x})$ for each $\gamma \in \Gamma_\alpha$.)

(2) If $x \in U_i \cap U_j$ then we have

$$tm_{l_j}(s_i(x)) = tm_{l_i}(s_j(x)) \in \mathcal{S}^{l_i l_j}(E_{\alpha,\gamma x}).$$

(3) s_i is *liftable and smooth* in the following sense. For each x there exists a smooth section $\tilde{s}_i$ of $\underbrace{E_\alpha \oplus \cdots \oplus E_\alpha}_{l_i \text{ times}}$ in a neighborhood of x such that

$$\tilde{s}_i(y) = (s_{i,1}(y), \cdots, s_{i,l_i}(y)), \quad s_i(y) = [s_{i,1}(y), \cdots, s_{i,l_i}(y)]. \tag{15.10}$$

We identify two multisections $(\{U_i\}, \{s_i\}, \{l_i\})$, $(\{U_i'\}, \{s_i'\}, \{l_i'\})$ if

$$tm_{l_i}(s_i(x)) = tm_{l_j'}(s_j'(x)) \in \mathcal{S}^{l_i l_j'}(E_{\alpha,\gamma x})$$

on $U_i \cap U_j'$. We say $s_{i,j}$ to be a *branch* of s_i in the situation of (15.10).

We next prove the following lemma which we used in section 11.

Lemma 15.13. *Let $\mathcal{M}$ have a T^n action and a T^n equivariant Kuranishi structure. Suppose that the T^n action on each of the Kuranishi neighborhood is free. Then we can descend the Kuranishi structure to $\mathcal{M}/T^n$ in a canonical way.*

Proof. Let $(V_\alpha, E_\alpha, \Gamma_\alpha, \psi_\alpha, s_\alpha)$ be a Kuranishi chart. Since T^n action on V_α is free V_α/T^n is a smooth manifold and $E_\alpha/T^n \to V_\alpha/T^n$ is a vector bundle. Since Γ_α action commutes with T^n action, it follows that it acts on this vector bundle. The T^n equivariance of s_α implies that we have a section $\overline{s}_\alpha$ of $E_\alpha/T^n \to V_\alpha/T^n$. Moreover since $\psi_\alpha : s_\alpha^{-1}(0) \to \mathcal{M}$ is T^n equivariant it induces a map $\overline{s}_\alpha^{-1}(0) \to \mathcal{M}/T^n$. Thus we obtain a Kuranishi chart. It is easy to define the coordinate changes. □

Definition 15.14. In the situation of Proposition 15.13, we say that a system of multisections of the Kuranishi structure of $\mathcal{M}$ *is* T^n *equivariant*, if it is induced from the multisection of the Kuranishi structure on $\mathcal{M}/T^n$ in an obvious way.

Corollary 15.15. *In the situation of Proposition 15.13, we assume that we have a* T^n *equivariant multisection at the boundary of* $\mathcal{M}$*, which is transversal to* 0*. Then it extends to a* T^n *equivariant multisection of* $\mathcal{M}$*.*

This is an immediate consequence of Lemma 3.14 [FO], that is the non-equivariant version.

16. Appendix 3 : Smooth correspondence via the zero set of multisection

In this section we explain the way how we use the zero set of multisection to define smooth correspondence, when appropriate submersive properties are satisfied.

Such a construction is a special case of the techniques of using a continuous family of multisections and integration along the fiber on their zero sets so that smooth correspondence by spaces with Kuranishi structure induces a map between de Rham complex.

This (more general) technique is not new and is known to some experts. In fact [Ru], section 16 [Fu2] use a similar technique and section 7.5 [FOOO3] (= section 33 [FOOO2]), [Fu4], [Fu5] contain the details of this more general technique.

We explain the special case (namely the case we use a single multisection) in our situation of toric manifold, for the sake of completeness and of reader's convenience.

Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a space with Kuranishi structure and $ev_s : \mathcal{M} \to L_s$, $ev_t : \mathcal{M} \to L_t$ be strongly continuous smooth maps. (Here s and t stand for source and target, respectively.) We assume our smooth manifolds L_s, L_t are compact and oriented without boundary. We also assume $\mathcal{M}$ has a tangent bundle and is oriented in the sense of Kuranishi structure.

Suppose that L_t has a free and transitive T^n action, and L_s and $\mathcal{M}$ have T^n action. We assume that the Kuranishi structure on $\mathcal{M}$ is T^n equivariant and the maps ev_s, ev_t are T^n equivariant.

Let $\{(V_\alpha, E_\alpha, \Gamma_\alpha, \psi_\alpha, s_\alpha)\}$ be a T^n equivariant Kuranishi coordinate system (good coordinate system) of $\mathcal{M}$. We use Corollary 15.15 to find a T^n equivariant (system) of multisection $\mathfrak{s}_\alpha : V_\alpha \to E_\alpha$ which is transversal to 0.

Let θ_α be a smooth differential form of compact support on V_α. We assume that θ_α is Γ_α-invariant. Let $f_\alpha : V_\alpha \to L_s$ be a Γ_α equivariant submersion. (The Γ_α action on L_s is trivial.) We next define *integration along the fiber*

$$((V_\alpha, E_\alpha, \Gamma_\alpha, \psi_\alpha, s_\alpha), \mathfrak{s}_\alpha, f_\alpha)_*(\theta_\alpha) \in \Omega^{\deg \theta_\alpha + \dim L_t - \dim \mathcal{M}}(L_t).$$

We first fix α. Let $(U_i, \mathfrak{s}_{\alpha,i})$ be a representative of $\mathfrak{s}_\alpha$. Namely $\{U_i \mid i \in I\}$ is an open covering of V_α and $\mathfrak{s}_\alpha$ is represented by $\mathfrak{s}_{\alpha,i}$ on U_i. By the definition of the

multisection, U_i is Γ_α-invariant. We may shrink U_i, if necessary, so that there exists a lifting $\tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_{\alpha,i} = (\tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_{\alpha,i,1}, \cdots, \tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_{\alpha,i,l_i})$ as in (15.10).

Let $\{\chi_i \mid i \in I\}$ be a partition of unity subordinate to the covering $\{U_i \mid i \in I\}$. By replacing χ_i with its average over Γ_α we may assume χ_i is Γ_α-invariant.

We put

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{s}}^{-1}_{\alpha,i,j}(0) = \{x \in U_i \mid \tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_{\alpha,i,j}(x) = 0\}. \tag{16.1}$$

By assumption $\tilde{\mathfrak{s}}^{-1}_{\alpha,i,j}(0)$ is a smooth manifold. Since the T^n action on L_t is free and transitive it follows that

$$ev_{t,\alpha}|_{\tilde{\mathfrak{s}}^{-1}_{\alpha,i,j}(0)} : \tilde{\mathfrak{s}}^{-1}_{\alpha,i,j}(0) \to L_t \tag{16.2}$$

is a submersion.

Definition 16.1. We define a differential form on L_t by

$$\begin{aligned} &((V_\alpha, E_\alpha, \Gamma_\alpha, \psi_\alpha, s_\alpha), \mathfrak{s}_\alpha, ev_{t,\alpha})_*(\theta_\alpha) \\ &= \frac{1}{\#\Gamma_\alpha} \sum_{i=1}^{I} \sum_{j=1}^{l_i} \frac{1}{l_i} (ev_{t,\alpha})_! \left(\chi_i \theta_\alpha |_{\tilde{\mathfrak{s}}^{-1}_{\alpha,i,j}(0)} \right). \end{aligned} \tag{16.3}$$

Here $(ev_{t,\alpha})_!$ is the integration along fiber of the smooth submersion (16.2).

Lemma 16.2. *The right hand side of (16.3) depends only on $(V_\alpha, E_\alpha, \Gamma_\alpha, \psi_\alpha, s_\alpha)$, $\mathfrak{s}_\alpha$, $ev_{t,\alpha}$, and θ_α but independent of the following choices :*

(1) *The choice of representatives $(\{U_i\}, \mathfrak{s}_{\alpha,i})$ of $\mathfrak{s}_\alpha$.*
(2) *The partition of unity χ_i.*

Proof. The proof is straightforward generalization of the proof of well-definedness of integration on manifold, which can be found in the text book of manifold theory, and is left to the leader. □

So far we have been working on one Kuranishi chart $(V_\alpha, E_\alpha, \Gamma_\alpha, \psi_\alpha, s_\alpha)$. We next describe the compatibility conditions of multisections for various α. During the construction we need to shrink V_α a bit several times. We will not explicitly mention this point henceforth.

Let $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2$. For $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2$, we take the normal bundle $N_{V_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}} V_{\alpha_2}$ of $\varphi_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}(V_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1})$ in V_{α_2}. We use an appropriate Γ_{α_2} invariant Riemannian metric on V_{α_2} to define the exponential map

$$\mathrm{Exp}_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1} : B_\varepsilon N_{V_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}} V_{\alpha_2} \to V_2. \tag{16.4}$$

(Here $B_\varepsilon N_{V_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}} V_{\alpha_2}$ is the ϵ neighborhood of the zero section of $N_{V_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}} V_{\alpha_2}$.)

Using $\mathrm{Exp}_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}$, we identify $B_\varepsilon N_{V_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}} V_{\alpha_2}/\Gamma_{\alpha_1}$ to an open subset of $V_{\alpha_1}/\Gamma_{\alpha_1}$ and denote it by $U_\epsilon(V_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}/\Gamma_{\alpha_1})$.

Using the projection

$$\mathrm{Pr}_{V_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}} : U_\epsilon(V_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}/\Gamma_{\alpha_1}) \to V_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}/\Gamma_{\alpha_1}$$

we extend the orbibundle E_{α_1} to $U_\epsilon(V_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}/\Gamma_{\alpha_1})$. Also we extend the embedding $E_{\alpha_1} \to \widehat{\varphi}^*_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1} E_{\alpha_2}$, (which is induced by $\widehat{\varphi}_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}$) to $U_\epsilon(V_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}/\Gamma_{\alpha_1})$.

We fix a Γ_α-invariant inner product of the bundles E_α. We then have a bundle isomorphism

$$E_{\alpha_2} \cong E_{\alpha_1} \oplus \frac{\widehat{\varphi}^*_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1} E_{\alpha_2}}{E_{\alpha_1}} \tag{16.5}$$

on $U_\varepsilon(V_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}/\Gamma_{\alpha_1})$. We can use Condition 15.3 to modify $\mathrm{Exp}_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}$ in (16.4) so that the following is satisfied.

Condition 16.3. If $y = \mathrm{Exp}_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}(\tilde{y}) \in U_\epsilon(V_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}/\Gamma_{\alpha_1})$ then

$$ds_{\alpha_2}(\tilde{y} \mod TV_{\alpha_1}) \equiv s_{\alpha_2}(y) \mod E_{\alpha_1}. \tag{16.6}$$

Let us explain the notation of (16.6). We remark that $\tilde{y} \in T_{\varphi_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}(x)}V_{\alpha_2}$ for $x = \mathrm{Pr}(\tilde{y}) \in V_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}$. Hence

$$\tilde{y} \mod TV_{\alpha_1} \in \frac{T_{\varphi_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}(x)}V_{\alpha_2}}{T_xV_{\alpha_1}}.$$

Therefore

$$ds_{\alpha_2}(\tilde{y} \mod TV_{\alpha_1}) \in \frac{(E_{\alpha_2})_{\varphi_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}(x)}}{(E_{\alpha_1})_x}.$$

(16.6) claims that it coincides with s_{α_2} modulo $(E_{\alpha_1})_x$.

We remark that Condition 15.3 implies that

$$[\tilde{y}] \mapsto ds_{\alpha_2}(\tilde{y} \mod TV_{\alpha_1}) : \frac{T_{\varphi_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}(x)}V_{\alpha_2}}{T_xV_{\alpha_1}} \longrightarrow \frac{(E_{\alpha_2})_{\varphi_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}(x)}}{(E_{\alpha_1})_x}$$

is an isomorphism. Therefore we can use the implicit function theorem to modify $\mathrm{Exp}_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}$ so that Condition 16.3 holds.

Definition 16.4. A multisection $\mathfrak{s}_{\alpha_2}$ of V_{α_2} is said to be *compatible* with $\mathfrak{s}_{\alpha_1}$ if the following holds for each $y = \mathrm{Exp}_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}(\tilde{y}) \in U_\epsilon(V_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}/\Gamma_{\alpha_1})$.

$$\mathfrak{s}_{\alpha_2}(y) = \mathfrak{s}_{\alpha_1}(\mathrm{Pr}(\tilde{y})) \oplus ds_{\alpha_2}(\tilde{y} \mod TV_{\alpha_1}). \tag{16.7}$$

We remark that $\mathfrak{s}_{\alpha_1}(w, \mathrm{Pr}(\tilde{y}))$ is a multisection of $\pi_{\alpha_1}^* E_{\alpha_1}$ and $ds_{\alpha_2}(\tilde{y} \mod TV_{\alpha_1})$ is a (single valued) section. Therefore via the isomorphism (16.5) the right hand side of (16.7) defines an element of $\mathcal{S}^{l_i}(E_{\alpha_2})_x$ ($x = \mathrm{Pr}(\tilde{y})$), and hence is regarded as a multisection of $\pi_{\alpha_2}^* E_{\alpha_2}$. In other words, we omit $\widehat{\varphi}_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}$ in (16.7).

We next choose a partition of unity χ_α subordinate to our Kuranishi charts. To define the notion of partition of unity, we need some notation. Let $\mathrm{Pr}_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1} : N_{V_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}}V_{\alpha_2} \to V_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}$ be the projection. We fix a Γ_{α_1}-invariant positive definite metric of $N_{V_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}}V_{\alpha_2}$ and let $r_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1} : N_{V_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}}V_{\alpha_2} \to [0,\infty)$ be the norm with respect to this metric. We fix a sufficiently small δ and let $\chi^\delta : \mathbb{R} \to [0,1]$ be a smooth function such that

$$\chi^\delta(t) = \begin{cases} 0 & t \geq \delta \\ 1 & t \leq \delta/2. \end{cases}$$

Let $U_\delta(V_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}/\Gamma_{\alpha_1})$ be the image of the exponential map. Namely

$$U_\delta(V_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}/\Gamma_{\alpha_1}) = \{\mathrm{Exp}(v) \mid v \in N_{V_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}}V_{\alpha_2}/\Gamma_{\alpha_1} \mid r_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}(v) < \delta\}.$$

We push out our function r_{α_2,α_1} to $U_\delta(V_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}/\Gamma_{\alpha_1})$ and denote it by the same symbol. We call r_{α_2,α_1} a *tubular distance function*. We require r_{α_2,α_1} to satisfy the compatibility conditions for various tubular neighborhoods and tubular distance functions, which is formulated in sections 5 and 6 in [Ma].

Let $x \in V_\alpha$. We put

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{A}_{x,+} &= \{\alpha_+ \mid x \in V_{\alpha_+,\alpha},\ \alpha_+ > \alpha\} \\ \mathfrak{A}_{x,-} &= \{\alpha_- \mid [x \mod \Gamma_\alpha] \in U_\delta(V_{\alpha,\alpha_-}/\Gamma_{\alpha_-}),\ \alpha_- < \alpha\}. \end{aligned}$$

For $\alpha_- \in \mathfrak{A}_{x,-}$ we take x_{α_-} such that $\mathrm{Exp}(x_{\alpha_-}) = x$.

Definition 16.5. A system $\{\chi_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \mathfrak{A}\}$ of Γ_α-equivariant smooth functions $\chi_\alpha : V_\alpha \to [0,1]$ of compact support is said to be a partition of unity subordinate to our Kuranishi chart if :

$$\chi_\alpha(x) + \sum_{\alpha_- \in \mathfrak{A}_{x,-}} \chi^\delta(r_{\alpha,\alpha_-}(x_{\alpha_-}))\chi_{\alpha_-}(\mathrm{Pr}_{\alpha,\alpha_-}(x_{\alpha_-})) + \sum_{\alpha_+ \in \mathfrak{A}_{x,+}} \chi_{\alpha_+}(\varphi_{\alpha_+,\alpha}(x)) = 1.$$

Lemma 16.6. *There exists a partition of unity subordinate to our Kuranishi chart. We may choose them so that they are T^n equivariant.*

Proof. We may assume that $\mathfrak{A}$ is a finite set since $\mathcal{M}$ is compact. By shrinking V_α if necessary we may assume that there exists V_α^- such that V_α^- is a relatively compact subset of V_α and that E_α, $\varphi_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}$, s_α, etc restricted to V_α^- still defines a good coordinate system. We take a Γ_α invariant smooth function χ'_α on V_α which has compact support and satisfies $\chi'_\alpha = 1$ on V_α^-. We define

$$h_\alpha(x) = \chi'_\alpha(x) + \sum_{\alpha_- \in \mathfrak{A}_{x,-}} \chi^\delta(r_{\alpha,\alpha_-}(x_{\alpha_-}))\chi'_{\alpha_-}(\mathrm{Pr}_{\alpha,\alpha_-}(x_{\alpha_-})) + \sum_{\alpha_+ \in \mathfrak{A}_{x,+}} \chi'_{\alpha_+}(\varphi_{\alpha_+,\alpha}(x)).$$

Using compatibility of tubular neighborhoods and tubular distance functions, we can show that h_α is Γ_α invariant and

$$h_{\alpha_2}(\varphi_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}(x)) = h_{\alpha_1}(x)$$

if $x \in V_{\alpha_2,\alpha_1}$. Therefore

$$\chi_\alpha(x) = \chi'_\alpha(x)/h_\alpha(x)$$

has the required properties. □

Now we consider the situation we start with. Namely we have two strongly continuous T^n equivariant smooth maps

$$ev_s : \mathcal{M} \to L_s, \qquad ev_t : \mathcal{M} \to L_t$$

and ev_t is weakly submersive. (In fact T^n action on L_t is transitive and free.)

Let a differential form h on L_s be given. We choose a T^n equivariant good coordinate system $\{(V_\alpha, E_\alpha, \Gamma_\alpha, \psi_\alpha, s_\alpha)\}$ of $\mathcal{M}$ and a T^n equivariant multisection represented by $\{\mathfrak{s}_\alpha\}$ in this Kuranishi chart. Assume that the multisection is transversal to zero.

We also choose a partition of unity $\{\chi_\alpha\}$ subordinate to our Kuranishi chart. Then we put

$$\theta_\alpha = \chi_\alpha(ev_{s,\alpha})^* h \tag{16.8}$$

which is a differential form on V_α.

Definition 16.7. Define

$$(\mathcal{M}; ev_s, ev_t)_*(h) = \sum_\alpha ((V_\alpha, \Gamma_\alpha, E_\alpha, \psi_\alpha, s_\alpha), \mathfrak{s}_\alpha, ev_{t,\alpha})_*(\theta_\alpha). \tag{16.9}$$

This is a smooth differential form on L_t. It is T^n equivariant if h is T^n equivariant.

Remark 16.8.
(1) Actually the right hand side of (16.9) *depends* on the choice of $(V_\alpha, E_\alpha, \Gamma_\alpha, \psi_\alpha, s_\alpha)$, $\mathfrak{s}_\alpha$. We write $\mathfrak{s}$ to demonstrate this choice and write $(\mathcal{M}; ev_s, ev_t, \mathfrak{s})_*(h)$.
(2) The right hand side of (16.9) is independent of the choice of partition of unity. The proof is similar to the well-definiedness of integration on manifolds.

In case $\mathcal{M}$ has a boundary $\partial\mathcal{M}$, the choices $(V_\alpha, E_\alpha, \Gamma_\alpha, \psi_\alpha, s_\alpha)$, $\mathfrak{s}_\alpha$ on $\mathcal{M}$ induces one for $\partial\mathcal{M}$. We then have the following :

Lemma 16.9 (Stokes' theorem)**.** *We have*

$$d((\mathcal{M}; ev_s, ev_t, \mathfrak{s})_*(h)) = (\mathcal{M}; ev_s, ev_t, \mathfrak{s})_*(dh) + (\partial\mathcal{M}; ev_s, ev_t, \mathfrak{s})_*(h). \quad (16.10)$$

We will discuss the sign at the end of this section.

Proof. Using the partition of unity χ_α it suffices to consider the case when $\mathcal{M}$ has only one Kuranishi chart V_α. We use the open covering U_i of V_α and the partition of unity again to see that we need only to study on one U_i. In that case (16.10) is immediate from the usual Stokes' formula. □

We next discuss composition of smooth correspondences. We consider the following situation. Let

$$ev_{s;st} : \mathcal{M}_{st} \to L_s, \qquad ev_{t;st} : \mathcal{M}_{st} \to L_t$$

be as before such that T^n action on L_t is free and transitive. Let

$$ev_{r;rs} : \mathcal{M}_{rs} \to L_r, \qquad ev_{s;rs} : \mathcal{M}_{rs} \to L_s$$

be a similar diagram such that T^n on L_s is free and transitive. Using the fact that $ev_{s;rs}$ is weakly submersive, we define the fiber product

$$\mathcal{M}_{rs\, ev_{s;rs}} \times_{ev_{s;st}} \mathcal{M}_{st}$$

as a space with Kuranishi structure. We write it as $\mathcal{M}_{rt}$. We have a diagram of strongly continuous smooth maps

$$ev_{r;rt} : \mathcal{M}_{rt} \to L_r, \qquad ev_{t;rt} : \mathcal{M}_{rt} \to L_t.$$

We next make choices $\mathfrak{s}^{st}$, $\mathfrak{s}^{rs}$ for $\mathcal{M}_{st}$ and $\mathcal{M}_{rs}$. It is easy to see that it determines a choice $\mathfrak{s}^{rt}$ for $\mathcal{M}_{rt}$.

Now we have :

Lemma 16.10 (Composition formula)**.** *We have the following formula for each differential form h on L_r.*

$$\begin{aligned} &(\mathcal{M}_{rt}; ev_{r;rt}, ev_{t;,rt}, \mathfrak{s}^{rt})_*(h) \\ &= ((\mathcal{M}_{st}; ev_{s;st}, ev_{t;,st}, \mathfrak{s}^{st})_* \circ (\mathcal{M}_{rs}; ev_{r;rs}, ev_{s;,rs}, \mathfrak{s}^{rs})_*)(h). \end{aligned} \quad (16.11)$$

Proof. Using a partition of unity it suffices to study locally on $\mathcal{M}_{rs}$, $\mathcal{M}_{st}$. In that case it suffices to consider the case of usual manifold, which is well-known. □

We finally discuss the signs in Lemmas 16.9 and 16.10. It is rather cumbersome to fix appropriate sign convention and show those lemmata with sign. So, instead, we use the trick of subsection 8.10.3 [FOOO3] (= section 53.3 [FOOO2]) (see also section 13 [Fu5]) to reduce the orientation problem to the case which is already discussed in Chapter 8 [FOOO3] (= Chapter 9 [FOOO2]), as follows.

The correspondence $h \mapsto (\mathcal{M}; ev_s, ev_t, \mathfrak{s})_*(h)$ extends to the currents h that satisfy appropriate transversality properties about its wave front set. (See [Hö].) We can also represent the smooth form h by an appropriate average (with respect to certain smooth measure) of a family of currents realized by smooth singular chains. So, as far as sign concerns, it suffices to consider a current realized by a smooth singular chain. Then the right hand side of (16.3) turn out to be a current realized by a smooth singular chain which is obtained from a smooth singular chain on L_s

by a transversal smooth correspondence. In fact, we may assume that all the fiber products appearing here are transversal, since it suffices to discuss the sign in the generic case. Thus the problem reduces to find a sign convention (and orientation) for the correspondence of the singular chains by a smooth manifold. In the situation of our application, such sign convention (singular homology version) was determined and analyzed in detail in Chapter 8 [FOOO3] (= Chapter 9 [FOOO2]). Especially, existence of an appropriate orientation that is consistent with the sign appearing in A_∞ formulae etc. was proved there. Therefore we can prove that there is a sign (orientation) convention which induces all the formulae we need with sign, in our de Rham version, as well. See subsection 8.10.3 [FOOO3] (= section 53.3 [FOOO2]) or section 13 [Fu5] for the detail.

References

[Ab] M. Abouzaid, *Morse homology, tropical geometry, and homological mirror symmetry for toric varieties*, Geom. Topol. 10 (2006), 1097–1157 (electronic).

[Au] M. Audin, Torus Actions on Symplectic Manifolds, Progress in Mathematics 93, Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2004.

[Aur] D. Auroux, *Mirror symmetry and T-duality in the complement of an anticanonical divisor*, J. Gökova Geom. Topol. 1 (2007), 51-91 (electronic), arXiv:0706.3207v2.

[AKO] D. Auroux, L. Katzarkov and D. Orlov, *Mirror symmetry for weighted projective planes and their noncommutative deformations*, Ann. of Math. 167 (2008) 867–943, mathAG/0404281.

[B1] V. Batyrev, *Quamtum cohomology rings of toric manifolds,* Journees de Geometrie Algebrique d'Orsay, 1992, Asterisque 218, 9-34.

[B2] V. Batyrev, *Dual polyhedra and mirror symmetry for Calabi-Yau hypersurfaces in toric varieties,* J. Alge. Geom. 3 (1994), no. 3, 493–535.

[BGR] S. Bosch, U. Güntzer and R. Remmert, Non-Archimedean Analysis. Asystematic Approach to Rigid Analytic Geometry, Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften 261, Springer-Verlag, Berline, 1984.

[CL] K. Chan and N.C. Leung, *Mirror symmetry for toric Fano manifolds via SYZ transformations*, arXiv:0801.2830.

[Che] Y.V. Chekanov, *Lagrangian intersections, symplectic energy, and areas of holomorphic curves,* Duke Math. J. 95 (1998), no. 1, 213–226.

[Cho] C.-H. Cho, *Non-displaceable Lagrangian submanifolds and Floer cohomology with non-unitary line bundle*, J. Geom. Phys. 58 (2008), 1465–1476, arXiv:0710.5454.

[CO] C.-H. Cho and Y.-G. Oh, *Floer cohomology and disc instantons of Lagrangian torus fibers in Fano toric manifolds*, Asian J. Math. 10 (2006), 773–814.

[CK] D. A. Cox, and S. Katz, Mirror Symmetry and Algebraic Geometry, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, 68. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1999.

[CS] K. Cieliebak and D. Salamon, *Wall crossing for symplectic vortices and quantum cohomology*, Math. Ann. 335 (2006), no. 1, 133–192.

[De] T. Delzant, *Hamiltoniens périodiques et image convexe de l'application moment*, Bull. Soc. Math. France 116 (1988), 315 – 339.

[Ei] D. Eisenbud, Commutative Algebra with a View Toward Algebraic Geometry, Graduate Text in Math. 150, Springer-Verlag, Berline, 1994.

[EP1] M. Entov and L. Polterovich, *Quasi-states and symplectic intersections*, Comment. Math. Helv. 81 (2006), 75–99.

[EP2] M. Entov and L. Polterovich, *Symplectic quasi-states and semi-simplicity of quantum homology*, in 'Toric topology', Contemp. Math. 460, 47–70, arXiv:0705.3735.

[EP3] M. Entov and L. Polterovich, *Rigid subsets of symplectic manifolds*, Compos. Math., 145 (2009) 773–826 , arXiv:0704.0105.

[Fl] A. Floer, *Morse theory for Lagrangian intersections,* J. Differ. Geom. 28 (1988), 513–547.

[Fu1] K. Fukaya, *Morse homotopy, A_∞-category and Floer homologies,* in Proceedings of GARC Workshop on Geometry and Topology, ed by H. J. Kim, Seoul National University, Korea 1933.

[Fu2] K. Fukaya, *Mirror symmetry of abelian variety and multi theta function*, J. Algebraic Geom. 11 393–512 2002

[Fu3] K. Fukaya, *Floer homology for families– a progress report*, Integrable systems, topology, and physics (Tokyo 2000), Contemp. Math. 309, Amer. Math. Soc. 2002, 33–68.

[Fu4] K. Fukaya, *Application of Floer homology of Lagrangian submanifolds to symplectic topology.* in 'Morse Theoretic Methods in Nonlinear Analysis and in Symplectic Topology", 231–276, NATO Sci. Ser. II Math. Phys. Chem., 217, Springer, Dordrecht, 2006.

[Fu5] K. Fukaya, *Differentiable operad, Kuranishi correspondence,and Foundation of topological field theories based on pseudo-holomorphic curve*, to appear in 'Arithmetic and Geometry around Quantization' Prog. Math., 279, Birkhäuser.

[FOOO1] K. Fukaya, Y.-G. Oh, H. Ohta and K. Ono, *Lagrangian intersection Floer theory-anomaly and obstruction,* Kyoto University preprint, 2000.

[FOOO2] K. Fukaya, Y.-G. Oh, H. Ohta and K. Ono, *Lagrangian intersection Floer theory-anomaly and obstruction,* expanded version of [FOOO1], 2006 & 2007.

[FOOO3] K. Fukaya, Y.-G. Oh, H. Ohta and K. Ono, *Lagrangian intersection Floer theory-anomaly and obstruction,* AMS/IP Studies in Advanced Mathematics, vol 46, in press, AMS/International Press.

[FOOO4] K. Fukaya, Y.-G. Oh, H. Ohta and K. Ono, *Lagrangian Floer theory on compact toric manifolds II : bulk deformations,* preprint 2008, arXiv:0810.5654.

[FOOO5] K. Fukaya, Y.-G. Oh, H. Ohta and K. Ono, *Canonical models of filtered A_∞-algebras and Morse complexes*, to appear in 'New Perspectives and Challenges in Symplectic Field Theory', CRM Proc. and Lecture Notes, 49, Amer. Math. Soc., arXiv:0812.1963.

[FO] K. Fukaya and K. Ono, *Arnold conjecture and Gromov-Witten invariant*, Topology 38 (1999), no. 5, 933–1048.

[Ful] W. Fulton, Introduction to Toric Varieties, Annals of Math. Studies, 131, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1993.

[Gi1] A. Givental, *Homological geometry and mirror symmetry*, in "Proceeding of the ICM-1994, Zürich, Basel, 1995, 472 - 480.

[Gi2] A. Givental, *Equivariant Gromov-Witten invariants*, Internat. Math. Res. Notices, 13 1996, 613 – 663.

[GrPa] T. Graber and R. Pandharipande, *Localization of virtual classes*, Invent. Math. 135 (1999), 487–518

[Gu] V. Guillemin, *Kähler structures on toric varieties*, J. Differ. Geom. 43 (1994), 285–309.

[H] H. Hofer, *On the topological properties of symplectic maps*, Proc. Royal Soc. Edinburgh 115 (1990), 25–38.

[Ho] K. Hori, *Linear models in supersymmetric D-branes,* Proceedings of the KIAS conference-Mirror Symmetry and Symplectic Geometry- (Seoul, 2000), eds by K. Fukaya, Y.-G. Oh, K. Ono and G. Tian, World Sci. Publishing, River Edge, New Jersey, 2001.

[HV] K. Hori and C. Vafa, *Mirror symmetry,* preprint, 2000, hep-th/0002222.

[MIRROR] K. Hori, S Katz, A. Klemm, R. Pandharipande, R. Thomas, C. Vafa, R. Vakil and E. Zaslow, Mirror Symmetry, Clay Mathematics Monographs, Amer. Math. Soc., 2003.

[Hö] L. Hörmander *Fourier integral operators I,* Acta Math., 127 (1971), 79 - 183.

[Iri1] H. Iritani, *Quantum D-modules and equivariant Floer theory for free loop spaces*, Math. Z. 252 (2006), 577 – 622.

[Iri2] H. Iritani, *Convergence of quantum cohomology by quantum Lefschetz*, J. Reine Angew. Math. 610 (2007), 29–69.

[Ko] M. Kontsevich, *Homological algebra of mirror symmetry,* ICM-1994 Proceedings, Zürich, Birkhäuser, 1995.

[Ku] A.G. Kushnirenko, *Polyédres de Newton et nombre de Milnor.* Invent. Math. 32 (1976) 1 – 31.

[LiRu] A.-M. Li and Y. Ruan, *Symplectic surgery and Gromov-Witten invariants of Calabi-Yau 3-folds,* Invent. Math. 145 (2001), no. 1, 151–218.

[Man] Y.I. Manin, Frobenius Manifolds, Quantum Cohomology, and Moduli Spaces, AMS Colloquium Publications, 47, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1999.

[Ma] J. Mather, *Stratifications and mappings,* Dynamical systems (Proc. Sympos., Univ. Bahia, Salvador, 1971) 41. 195–232. Academic Press. New York. 1973.

[Mat] H. Matsumura, Commutative Algebra, Benjamin, 1970.

[MW] J. Marsden and A. Weinstein, *Reduction of symplectic manifolds with symmetry*, Reports of Math. Phys. 5, (1974) 121–130.

[MT] D. McDuff and S. Tolman, *Topological properties of Hamiltonian circle actions*, Int. Math. Res. Pap. 2006, 72826, 1 – 77.

[Mc] D. McDuff, *Displacing Lagrangian toric fibers via probes*, preprint, arXiv:0904.1686.

[Mi] J. Milnor, Singular Points of Complex Hypersurfaces, Ann. Math. Studies Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton N.J., 1968

[Na] M. Nagata, Local rings. Interscience Tracts in Pure and Applied Math. 13, Interscience Publishers a division of John Wiley & Sons New York-London 1962

[Oh1] Y.-G. Oh, *Floer cohomology of Lagrangian intersections and pseudo-holomorphic discs I,* Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 46 (1993), 949-994 addenda, ibid, 48 (1995), 1299–1302.

[Oh2] Y.-G. Oh, *Symplectic topology as the geometry of action functional II*, Commun. Anal. Geom. 7 (1999), 1 – 55

[Oh3] Y.-G. Oh, *Construction of spectral invariants of Hamiltonian paths on closed symplectic manifolds*, in "The Breadth of Symplectic and Poisson Geometry", Prog. Math. 232, 525 – 570, Birkhäuser, Boston, 2005.

[Oh4] Y.-G. Oh, *Floer mini-max theory, the Cerf diagram, and the spectral invariants*, J. Korean Math. Soc. 46 (2009), 363 – 447, mathSG/0406449 (v4 2007).

[Ohta] H. Ohta, *Obstruction to and deformation of Lagrangian intersection Floer cohomology*, Symplectic Geometry and Mirror Symmetry (Seoul, 2000), K. Fukaya, Y.-G. Oh, K. Ono and G. Tian ed., World Sci. Pulishing, River Edge, 2001, pp. 281–309.

[Ru] Y. Ruan, *Virtual neighborhood and pseudoholomorphic curve.* Turkish J. Math. 1999 161–231

[Sa] K. Saito, *Period mapping associated to a primitive form*, Publ. R.I.M.S. 19 (1983), 1231 –1261.

[Sc] M. Schwarz, *On the action spectrum for closed symplectically aspherical manifolds*, Pacific J. Math. 193 (2000), 419–461.

[Se1] P. Seidel, π_1 *of symplectic automorphism groups and invertibles in quantum homology rings*, Geom. Funct. Anal. 7 (1997), no. 6, 1046–1095.

[Se2] P. Seidel, Fukaya Categories and Picard-Lefschetz Theory, European Mathematical Society (EMS), Zürich, 2008.

[Ue] K. Ueda, *Homological mirror symmetry for toric del Pezzo surfaces*, Comm. Math. Phys. 264 (2006), 71 – 85.

[Us] M. Usher, *Spectral numbers in Floer theories*, Compositio Math. 144 (2008), 1581-1592, arXiv:0709.1127.

[Vi] C. Viterbo, *Symplectic topology as the geometry of generating functions*, Math. Ann. 292 (1992), 685–710.

Department of Mathematics, Kyoto University, Kyoto, Japan
E-mail address: fukaya@math.kyoto-u.ac.jp

Department of Mathematics, University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI, USA &
Korea Institute for Advanced Study, Seoul, Korea
E-mail address: oh@math.wisc.edu

Graduate School of Mathematics, Nagoya University, Nagoya, Japan
E-mail address: ohta@math.nagoya-u.ac.jp

Department of Mathematics, Hokkaido University, Sapporo, Japan
E-mail address: ono@math.sci.hokudai.ac.jp